The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:
REV. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D. | REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
MR. B. L. MANNING, M.A. | REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s.-6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at 35 Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XVIII, No. 2 **APRIL, 1940**

CONTENTS.

[For biographical sketches of the contributors see page v.]

		PAGE
EDITORIAL		129
TWO TYPES OF DEMOCRACY	SIR ALFRED ZIMMERN	137
THE ATONEMENT, GOD'S ACT	WILLIAM E. WILSON	146
THE "MADRAS" REPORTS	KENNETH G. GRUBB	156
THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	H. H. ROWLEY	164
THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC SOCIETY	J. H. WILSON	178
FACILIS DESCENSUS AVERNI	M. CHANING-PEARCE	184
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—		
A PROTESTANT IN ITALY	J. STANLEY PERKINS	193
BIBLE HUNGER ABROAD	BLANCHE M. MOORE	195
ON LIFE AND BOOKS—		
MATTHEW ARNOLD	A. T. S. JAMES	200
WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS		204
FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS—		
HERMANN RAUSCHNING	W. G. MOORE	206
CURRENT LITERATURE. By the EDITOR, Drs. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, R. S. FRANKS, W. B. SELBIE, the Revs. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D., F. WRIGLEY, B.A., L. E. COOKE, B.A., B.D., Mr. S. H. MOORE, M.A., and the Rev. G. F. NUTTALL, M.A., B.D.		210
SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST. By the EDITOR, Drs. H. WHEELER ROBINSON, A. J. GRIEVE, W. B. SELBIE, the Rev. A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., Mr. P. A. SPALDING, M.A., and the Rev. G. F. NUTTALL, M.A., B.D.		224
PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS		238

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

Church Furniture of Fine Craftsmanship | **Stained Glass** of Rich Colouring | **Memorial Tablets** with Beautiful Lettering

This very beautiful Carved Oak Communion Table, 4ft. 6ins. in length, with words "This Do in Remembrance of Me" carved in bold relief. Carriage Paid £24

ILLUSTRATED BOOKLETS POST FREE. *(Mention probable requirements.)*

G. MAILE & SON Ltd. 367 EUSTON ROAD LONDON, N.W.1

Telephone Euston 1731 CHURCH FURNISHERS

BORN into *TRAGEDY*

Friendless, unwanted babies and children, so badly wronged, so handicapped in life. . . Do please help to give them the blessings of love, a good home and proper upbringing.

4,350 have been befriended. Over 3,400 adopted into permanent happy Christian homes. 700 have passed through the F. B. Meyer Children's Home. 3,460 boarded out with registered selected Foster Mothers.

The Beatrice Elizabeth Home, Needham Market, is doing splendid work for children between the ages of five and sixteen years; these young lives are responding to Christian love and training.

100 now dependent upon us for their food and clothing.

We plead in Christ's name for Homeless and Friendless Children

Donations most urgently needed, if we are to continue this ministry of mercy. Cheques, P.O.s, crossed Barclays Bank, payable Gordon Harmer, Esq., Hon. Treasurer.

HOMELESS CHILDREN'S AID & ADOPTION SOCIETY

AND F. B. MEYER CHILDREN'S HOME

93, Westminster Bridge Road, London, S.E.1

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

Sir ALFRED E. ZIMMERN. Montague Burton Professor of International Relations in the University of Oxford.

Mr. WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D. Formerly Professor in the Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham. Author of *The Problem of the Cross*.

Mr. KENNETH G. GRUBB. Formerly a missionary in Brazil. Since 1930 on the staff of the World Dominion Press.

Rev. H. H. ROWLEY, D.D. Professor of the Semitic Languages, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

Mr. J. H. WILSON, B.A. Economics Fellow, University College, Oxford.

Mr. M. CHANING-PEARCE, M.A. South Leigh, Oxon. Author of *Religion and Reality*.

Rev. J. STANLEY PERKINS, M.A. Congregational Minister, Manchester.

Miss BLANCHE M. MOORE. Southampton.

Rev. A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc. Congregational Minister; author of *Sceptre of Faith, etc.*

Mr. W. G. MOORE, M.A., D.Lit. (Strasburg). Lecturer in French in the University of Oxford.

Rev. LESLIE E. COOKE, B.A., B.D. Congregational Minister, Coventry.

Mr. P. A. SPALDING, M.A. Formerly of Balliol College, Oxford. Author of *Fragments for Corinna*.

Rev. GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL, M.A., B.D. Congregational Minister, Warminster. Editor of *Letters of John Pinney*.

Sunday
AT HOME AND OVERSEA

WAR increases the need for a magazine which will promote neighbourliness and the search for spiritual values. 'Sunday at Home and Oversea' does these things.

It provides also mental recreation different from week-day reading. Are you, for example, reading S. P. B. Mais's 'Diary of a Public Schoolmaster in War Time'?

Christian workers find its non-sectarian survey of missionary activities valuable.

OTHER FEATURES ARE:—

- *Travel articles, reviving holiday happiness*
- *Attractive fiction*
- *Nature studies*
- *Helps to Book Reading*
- *All well illustrated*

SUNDAY at Home and Oversea
(Incorporating 'Great Thoughts')

★ **Ask your newsagent or bookstall for the current number and ensure future supplies by giving a standing order**

1/-
MONTHLY

Send for specimen copy

DEPT. CQ 440
4 BOUVERIE-STREET
LONDON E.C.4

The Leys School, CAMBRIDGE

President:
THE PRESIDENT OF THE METHODIST CONFERENCE.

Chairman of the Governors:
THE RT. HON. LORD STAMP, G.C.B., D.Sc., LL.D.

Headmaster:
W. G. HUMPHREY, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon)

JUNIOR SCHOLARSHIPS AND EXHIBITIONS

Three or four Open Foundation Scholarships of £100 a year and five or six other Scholarships and Exhibitions of between £25 and £75 a year are available for award in 1940 on the result of an examination held early in the Summer Term. Candidates must be under 14 on the 1st January, 1940. Scholarships and Exhibitions may in certain cases be increased by such an amount as the circumstances of the Scholar may require.

Full particulars may be obtained from the HEADMASTER OF THE LEYS.

St. Faith's School, CAMBRIDGE

Headmaster:
W. G. BUTLER, M.A. (Cantab.)

St. Faith's (Preparatory) School was founded in 1884, and was acquired by the Governors of The Leys in July, 1938. The School, with its 10 acres of grounds and playing fields, is situated within five minutes' walk of The Leys, and at certain times the Science Laboratories, Art School, Swimming Bath and Workshops of The Leys are reserved for the use of the boys at St. Faith's. The enlarged buildings are now completed.
Boys are admitted at the age of 7, and are prepared for entrance, either by Scholarship or the Common Entrance Examination, to The Leys and other Public Schools.

Full particulars may be obtained from the HEADMASTER OF ST. FAITH'S.

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THESE are bad times. There is no doubt about that. They are bad times for us individual Christians. They are bad times for the churches, as some of these notes show only too clearly. We are all fully aware of that, and we have all said it many times this winter. There is some danger that we may be so much obsessed by the sense of our own difficulties as to imagine that the war has made things difficult only for us.

Now to imagine that would be a great mistake. Our neighbours are having quite as bad a time as we are. Some of them are having a worse time. The horror and the uncertainty of these days afflict us all. They rob us all of many of the best things that life used to give. But there is this difference. When a Christian has been robbed of all the good things that this world provides, he has still something left. When many other people are robbed of all the good things that this world provides, they have nothing whatsoever left. The sadness of our time has given to us Christians an opportunity and a duty here which we must by no means neglect.

There is however one group of our neighbours on whose distresses we may be pardoned for looking without much pity. Some of us would be guilty of hypocrisy if we did not at once admit that we observe their sufferings at worst with equanimity and at best with profound satisfaction. We all know that noisy group of people who have prided themselves in private and in public, in season and out of season, on the alleged fact that they are more intelligent than the rest of us. In particular of course they have prided themselves on being very much more intelligent than the ruck of the poor fools in the churches. Christianity, they have sneered ceaselessly, is merely out of date. It is allied with every reactionary instinct and with every deplorable political influence. Its decay is a sure and necessary condition of social and intellectual progress. By the crumbling of religious observances and the disintegration of Christian thought, you can measure the progress of our generation to emancipation and enlightened happiness. The malicious pleasure with which such persons have watched what they have believed to be the disappearance of Christian thought and the Christian church is well known to all of us.

* * *

How have these people been faring lately? The question is both interesting and profitable. For a long time before the war

(like the Sons of Belial in Dryden's poem) they "had a glorious time". They had a glorious time especially when they looked abroad, and they had the best time of all when they looked abroad so far that they could see nothing distinctly. What China was to the doctrinaire prigs of the eighteenth century Russia was to ours. It was an earthly Paradise which could be held up to depress and reproach those of us who had the misfortune to live in Europe. In Russia, we were told, we could see what must happen in due time everywhere else. In particular the "liquidation" of religion in Russia pointed the way to better things.

Germany, like most things nearer and more plainly visible, presented to our friends a picture far less agreeable than Russia. From the first moment that Hitler came into control they had an uncomfortable feeling. In the Nazi movement they discerned very accurately something inimical to all the things which they valued most. The success of the Nazis was a threat to the kind of life that they wished to live. The more they looked at Germany the less they liked it. At last cold fear overtook them. They had to admit the dreadful truth: the world had brought forth something which was even worse than Christianity. As long as the Nazis were about, our friends could not reserve their worst words for the Church.

This in itself was disagreeable enough; but something more disagreeable was to follow. Nazi rule and Christianity, bad as they both were, could not agree with one another. It might have been supposed that the enemies of the Good and the True would at least do that, but a very little time sufficed to make it clear that Nazi rule and Christianity disagreed violently with one another. Christianity was plainly the most hated and the most subtly dangerous foe to the Nazi regime. This was indeed a monstrous outrage on the enemies of the Faith here in England. It could not be denied that Christians were defying Nazi rule and were suffering persecution. And what Christians were doing this? Not merely the less objectionable type of Christians, but dyed-in-the-wool churchmen, priests and worse than priests—Protestant clergymen of the most horrid *bourgeois* type, the very incarnation of everything that is most hateful to people who have fed on the homiletical labours of Mr. Chapman Cohen and Mr. Joad. A world in which these things happen is a very disagreeable world indeed for some of the opponents of Christianity. They have had to watch the outworn contemptible superstition, Christianity, playing a heroic part in Nazi concentration camps. They have had to watch it writing a fresh chapter in the history of the noble army of martyrs. They have had to watch Holy Russia, "my country, right or wrong", joining to help the very power which its frenzied English votaries have praised it for opposing.

The more honest of our opponents either admit the awkwardness of the situation or say nothing about it. But there is another way. A gallant troupe of second-rate highbrows can still be found in the universities and in the suburban intelligentsia who are prepared to explain why Nazi rule and Christianity, being each the worst thing in the world, disagree, whilst Nazi rule and Holy Russia, being the worst and the best thing in the world respectively, agree. In times as gloomy as these the plain man may be forgiven for seizing some satisfaction from the sight of these clever persons floundering deeper and deeper in the mud which they have painfully collected to throw at everything that is holy. If we Christians are at war with error, it is a legitimate and heartening exercise to observe it consuming itself.

Let it not be thought that we expect the embarrassment of our opponents to last long. They will probably reconcile themselves to Nazi rule as soon as it reconciles itself a little more to Holy Russia. Nor must we exaggerate a paradox, however congenial, for the sake of rhetorical effect. After all, the only thing that has been perfectly clear about Russia since 1917 has been the definite and consistent and conscious policy of its rulers to make an end of Christianity. Everything else about Russia has changed from time to time. Everything else about Russia has been obscure. But this determination by one method or another to make an end of Christianity has stood out clear from the start. As Nazi rule grows more and more determined also to make an end of Christianity the reconciliation will be easy, and so, with a desire to give our opponents everything that they are entitled to have, we refrain from pressing the charge of inconsistency too far against them.

The tragedy of all this, as it concerns us, lies at home. It lies in the pitiful plight of those well-meaning liberals who have no religious foundations for their political faith. (Need we add that in writing of liberals and liberalism, we are using the words generally, and not of political parties?) In the past many of them have rejected such a foundation with scorn. They have looked upon it as an unnecessary encumbrance. But to-day they find the ground slipping beneath them. They have had a genuine and most precious belief in the value of individual men, in freedom, in humane standards of behaviour, in the application of morality to the State as well as to private persons, in the end *not* justifying the means. This genuine and most precious belief they still hold. So far, good. So far, very good. But some of those who hold this faith have forgotten, or have never understood, that in the modern world (whatever may be said of pre-Christian antiquity) these excellent political creeds are but one of the political shadows of historic Christianity. Political liberty, as Dr. Figgis taught us long ago and as some of his pupils are now trying to

forget, is but the by-product of the struggle for religious liberty. If you destroy the religious substance, the political shadow will not long remain with you. The pagan totalitarian State of the Russian and German pattern allows no room, no *Lebensraum,* for the Church or for Christian teaching. How then can it allow room for Christian living? Even when it pretends to allow room for Christian living, it removes the means by which alone such living is supported. A State like Russia, to which the Gospels and the Epistle to the Galatians may not be taken, is not a State which will bring forth humane standards for private life or free action in public life.

* * *

Lord Acton once called the eighteenth century the age of repentant monarchy. There are signs that the twentieth century may come to be called the age of repentant liberalism. There are signs that some of those who cherished, apart from the Church, the great faith in human nature and human liberty have seen that the Church too cherishes this same great faith—with notable additions and with added security. In a struggle against totalitarian despotism the Church and liberalism are natural allies. The scorn with which religion has been treated by many liberal thinkers even in England for two generations is utterly out of place; and liberal thought cannot afford to throw away any ally if it wishes to survive. We look to see the making of this alliance, and on our side we must help it. It would be but the renewal of an old alliance.

We like our phrase *the age of repentant liberalism.* We are tempted to go on to ask if it cannot be applied as appropriately to theological as to political liberalism. Theological liberalism, like political liberalism, conserves the precious fruits of a thousand victories which sometimes seem in jeopardy to-day. It would be a tragedy if theological liberalism were to die; but without repentance it seems likely to see only few and evil days.

B. L. M.

* * *

In the absence of Dr. Peel in America, I am asked to make some contribution to the editorial comments in this present issue. I gladly respond to the Editor's request that I should do something to justify my existence as a member of the Editorial Board, though I am fully alive to the fact that I cannot possibly emulate the Chairman-Elect of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in his breezy provocativeness. I must leave that to my co-sub-editor, Mr. Manning. Meanwhile we shall all of us wish for Dr. Peel good success in his visit to the United States. We have no doubt that he will have many opportunities in the course of conversations with the religious leaders of America to "put them wise" to what is really happening in Europe in these tragic and critical days. A vigorous German propaganda specially directed towards

America encourages widespread suspicion as to the aims of the Allies and uneasy dissatisfaction with their methods. Even among our Congregational brethren in the States, with whom, but for the War, we should have been forgathering at Wellesley in July, there is a tendency towards criticism and aloofness. We can wholeheartedly understand American determination to keep out of the War if at all possible. We only wish we had been able to keep out of it ourselves. There is, however, real need for an interpretation to the mind of America of a situation that calls at the very least for understanding sympathy. If the International Congregational Council could have been held as planned, it would have afforded a priceless opportunity for an interchange of ideas between Congregationalists on both sides of the Atlantic at a crisis in history in which precisely those ideals that are common to Congregationalists everywhere are being challenged to the death. In lieu of that, no one can more effectively interpret to America the mind of British Congregationalism than Dr. Peel. Our American brethren know him and trust him. We wish him *bon voyage* and a safe return.

* * *

It is high time that our leaders should give serious consideration to the plight in which many of our Congregational ministers find themselves as one of the results of the War situation. In face of the steadily rising cost of living and of expenses increasing in all directions, thousands of people in all classes are being seriously impoverished. For many, however, there is some compensation afforded by increased rates of wages—but ministers, unhappily, are not in this class. On the contrary, many of them, especially those at work in what are regarded as danger zones, have to meet the higher cost of living with salaries drastically reduced. Evacuation, voluntary or compulsory, and the diminished purchase power of money, have brought about such a decline in collections as to make it impossible to maintain the minister's salary at its normal level.

Let me quote two or three typical cases. (1) A popular resort on the South-East coast, where the Congregational Church for years has drawn its membership and support very largely from London business men and their families who can afford to live at some considerable distance from the scene of their commercial or professional activities. The War has driven many of these people away. They have sought houses or accommodation in less vulnerable areas, leaving the Church, which hitherto has depended largely upon their support, to meet its obligations as best it may. Those who remain, viz., the people who either will not or cannot transfer their residences to safer districts, are left to carry an impossible burden. Depleted in numbers, and with sadly reduced financial resources, the Church has very reluctantly to come to the conclusion that the only item of expense upon which any adequate economy can be

exercised, is the salary of the minister, who has accepted the situation as a Christian man should with all goodwill, and is now in receipt of half his former salary. But even so, it is difficult for the Church to raise the money, and impossible for the minister to live on it, even when he has drastically reduced his commitments on all sides.

(2) A well-known Church in the London area, which up to September last was carrying on a splendid work under the leadership of a new and vigorous minister. Within a few days of the outbreak of the War only six out of fourteen deacons were still in London, many members of the retired class had temporarily removed, and many business people, including Civil Servants of various types, had been evacuated. Among these latter was the Church Secretary. The Sunday School had been almost entirely wiped out—there were only 14 scholars left. Immediate and drastic economies were called for. In order to save expense on heat and black-out, the Church building was abandoned in favour of the Hall, musical expenses were cut down; indeed everything was done that could be done to reduce outgoings. It was manifest, however, that it would be impossible to carry on without further saving. The minister took the initiative and, with the cordial consent of the deacons, sought and obtained employment outside the Church, which enabled him to relieve the Church of part of his salary. This means that he is away from the Church and its work all the week except from Friday evening to Sunday evening. For his assumption of this double burden he is worthy of all praise.

(3) A very influential suburban Church consisting, for the most part, of Civil Servants and professional men, finds itself abandoned *en masse,* the minister being left with a small handful of people who simply cannot maintain the work of the Church at its normal level.

These and similar cases prompt us to ask whether those who have had to remove from one district to another as a result of the War emergency ought not to recognize some responsibility for financial support of the Churches from which, either voluntarily or under compulsion, they now absent themselves. In many cases these people have been responsible for the building of the Churches in question, and have helped to secure for them an able and popular ministry. Some day, no doubt, they hope to return to them. But in the meantime, ought they to be content to leave the remnant that remains to struggle on as best it may? Is it right that the whole burden should now fall upon people who cannot remove their homes, and who are now less able than ever to give any large measure of financial support? Ought it not to be a matter of *noblesse oblige* on the part of people who have sought safety in other districts to continue their support of the Church they have left for the time being, and to help to maintain the salary of the

minister whom they themselves called, and who accepted the call in reliance upon their support? Otherwise the minister is likely to be overwhelmed with anxieties, however silent he may be about them, while the Church itself becomes disheartened and inclined to let things drift, with the result that, when peace returns, the Church will either have gone under altogether, or will have lost all courage and vision just at the time when eagerness and vitality will be most called for.

For the time being the admirable plan of the Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales to secure a large sum of money for Church Extension has had to be shelved. But if things go on as at present, we shall have upon our hands a much bigger problem when the War comes to an end, viz., the revival and maintenance of Churches which the War has almost destroyed. Ought we not to be planning ahead for contingencies of this sort? And ought we not to be pressing upon the consciences of those who have left their Churches for the time being the duty of contributing to their maintenance, not simply for the sake of the ministry, but also for the sake of the Churches and their future?

There is another aspect of the problem which concerns our retired ministers—those veterans who, after 40 years or more of devoted service to our Churches, have somehow to make ends meet upon a retiring allowance which is hopelessly inadequate at the best of times, and certainly leaves no margin to meet the higher cost of living. Most of these men are compelled to eke out their resources by acting as supplies for vacant Churches or for ministers temporarily absent from their pulpits. Their need for such supplementary income is now more urgent than ever. Many Churches, however, are not only reducing their supply fees, but are making less use of ministers who are retired or out of charge, taking advantage of lay help instead of ministerial as a means of exercising economy. No one will deny that it is a good thing that our lay preachers should be afforded a larger opportunity for usefulness. They have been neglected far too long by many of our Churches. Some of these latter have never in their history had a lay preacher in their pulpit until these War-time days. No doubt they will have gained spiritually as well as financially. All honour to the laymen who serve our pulpits when the opportunity is offered. Nevertheless it is part of the grim tragedy of impecunious retirement that our veterans should at this time have to undergo a further cut in income because necessity is laid upon the Churches to practise a rigid economy in the matter of pulpit-supplies. One pathetic case has come to my notice in which a minister, almost reduced to despair, has been driven to offer a Church Secretary a small commission if he would secure for him an appointment for a Sunday supply. Oh, the pity of it!

One of our leading industrialists told me that during the last War his firm was under Government control, which meant, among other things, that from time to time the firm was instructed by the Board of Trade to increase wages all round by some specified proportion, 5%, 10%, or what not. On every occasion when wages were increased in this way, the Management Committee of the local Congregational Church decreed that the wages of the Chapel-keeper should be increased by the same proportion. Splendid! This was very fair, and right, and Christian. But the significant thing was that from the beginning to the end of the War it did not occur to anyone to make the slightest hint that the salary of the minister should be augmented as well. As a matter of fact, during the last War many ministers suffered considerable hardship owing to the fact that their salaries remained stationary from 1914 to 1918, and even afterwards, and that in spite of general increases among all other classes to meet the increased cost of living. To-day, things are more difficult still for the ministry. In face of increased expenditure we have reduced salaries.

A still further problem arises out of the fact that not a few Churches which have recently become vacant have more or less definitely decided to remain vacant for the duration of the War with a view to economy. In most cases this is a suicidal policy. It means a definite cut in the efficiency of the Church's work precisely at the time when leadership and sacrificial service are called for more than ever. Incidentally it also means that ministers who badly need a change of pastorate will find opportunities still further curtailed, while some perhaps may have to remain unemployed for indefinite periods. For the time being perhaps this part of the problem may be mitigated to some extent by the increasing demand for Army Chaplains—only to be further intensified perhaps with the return of the Chaplains at the end of the War.

E. J. P.

* * *

We have received many letters in regard to the suggestion that the contents of the *Quarterly* should be printed on the cover. At the moment the vote is decidedly in favour of the change. We shall, therefore, unless there is a swing of the pendulum, make this change next January with the beginning of a new volume. Meanwhile, indexes for 1939 are available to anybody who will send a large stamped addressed envelope and threepence in stamps to The Independent Press, Ltd., Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4. There have been one or two requests for indexes of back numbers: these are also obtainable.

Editor.

TWO TYPES OF DEMOCRACY.

By Sir Alfred Zimmern.

I.

Only a generation separates the war of 1914-18 from the war of to-day: but it might be a century. For the first, as we can see now, was a nineteenth century war, whereas the second belongs wholly to the twentieth.

The war of 1914-18, more especially in its later phase, after the intervention of the United States and the collapse of Tsarist Russia, was a war which ranged modern Liberalism against ancient Privilege. On the one side were ideas and forces that had been dynamic factors in the life of nineteenth century Europe: arrayed against them, fighting as it then seemed a stubborn rear-guard action, were certain lingering notions which, under the protection of reactionary European states, had survived from the eighteenth and earlier centuries. Democracy and Nationality were the watchwords of the Western Powers—the same watchwords that Mazzini had inscribed on his banner nearly a hundred years before. It is true that, from the eighteen-sixties onwards, under Bismarck and his successors, the forces opposed to liberalism had once more asserted their power in Central Europe. But this seemed no more than a temporary rally against the inevitable onward sweep of "progressive" forces from the West—forces that were steadily undermining not only the fabric of the new German Reich but also the more old-fashioned structures of the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman Empires further East.

The challenge of 1914 was indeed not of the Western Powers' seeking, but when it came there could, it seemed, be no doubt as to what was at stake. As Sir Edward Grey told the Austrian Ambassador at the opening of the crisis, if war broke out all the sleeping issues of 1848 would be re-awakened. The cause of the Allies was the cause of Democracy and Nationality—*as the nineteenth century understood them,* Democracy according to John Stuart Mill and Nationality according to Mazzini. Thus it was that the constitutions drawn up, after the victory of the allied arms and ideas, in Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Central and East European States, bore the imprint of Mill's theories and even of his fads, while the map of Europe between 1918 and the Fourth Partition of Poland paid silent tribute to Mazzini.

But before the guns had ceased vociferating in this contest between the nineteenth century and the eighteenth a new contestant broke suddenly in upon the scene—the very incarnation of the twentieth century, as it seemed to many at the time and seems to

some intellectual stragglers even yet. A voice rang out from Brest-Litovsk addressed "to all", and the doctrine that this new prophet preached was a doctrine of democracy—but not the doctrine of Mill. Mr. Wheeler-Bennett's colourful pen[1] has reconstituted for us the historic scene, in which self-educated men of the people who had spent their lives in prison or in hiding, together with a few odd samples of the unthinking masses, sat cheek by jowl with generals and old-time diplomats, astonishing them by their audacity in conducting a novel and hitherto unheard-of type of warfare. Mass-propaganda had emerged as a force of the first order in international relations. Within a few months it had penetrated the enemy front and become a powerful factor in its disintegration. During the succeeding twenty years it achieved triumph after triumph, so that to the historian, looking back, the twenty years that expired last September will not bear the mark of Woodrow Wilson, the belated transatlantic pupil of the nineteenth century European Liberals, but of a series of great Democrats—or shall we call them Tribunes?—Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, Mussolini in Italy, and Hitler in Germany, with a penumbra of lesser figures who, whatever the colour of their shirt or their programme, had all learnt in the same school how to fashion their appeal to the sovereign people.

In 1940 the Germany of William II, the Austria-Hungary of Francis Joseph and the Russia of Nicholas II are gone past recall. One or two islands of ancient privilege can still be discerned amid the flood of the popular waters, but they are of no significance in the general European scene. The issue to-day is not between Democracy and Aristocracy, but between two different kinds of democracy, each with its own history, its own theory and its own technique.

Are we to discard Mill and install the Tribunes in his stead? Or are we to retain the essence of his doctrine, applying it to the new conditions with which we are faced in the fourth decade of the twentieth century?

The same question faces us, perhaps even more urgently, in connexion with the other nineteenth century watchword, Nationality. What elements in Mazzini's teaching ought we to retain? What meaning do we attach to that Principle of Nationality, to which nineteenth century Liberals paid such homage, whilst tacitly limiting its validity to the people of the European continent? Can the Rights of Nations be reconciled in the interdependent modern world with the Common Good? Was there not an unresolved contradiction in Woodrow Wilson's thinking when he set self-determination and the League of Nations side by side as the two pillars of the new world-order?

[1] *Brest-Litovsk: The Forgotten Peace*, by J. W. Wheeler-Bennett. Macmillan, 1938.

These are pressing questions, but we cannot pursue them further in these pages. Our immediate concern is with the two types of Democracy.

II.

Mill's *Considerations on Representative Government,* which is the fullest statement of his teaching on democracy, was published in 1861. At that time this country, though it regarded itself as in the van of European progress, was not a democracy. The greater part of the nation was unenfranchised. Household suffrage, bringing votes to the male members of the upper section of the working class, was introduced six years later, in 1867. But in the House of Commons that passed Disraeli's Reform Act genuine democrats were few and far between. "To say that the Tory Party were traditionally opposed to household suffrage", remarks the biographer of Lord Salisbury, "would be to state the facts very inadequately. It had been regarded for years as the ultimate calamity". In her entertaining book on *The Minor Pleasures of Life,* one of which is to lament on how the country is "going to the dogs", Miss Rose Macaulay recalls Carlyle's account of a conversation with his friend, the poet Southey, which crystallizes the Tory attitude to democracy in the period between the French Revolution and the eighteen-seventies:

> We sat on the sofa together: our talk was long and earnest: topic, ultimately the usual one, steady approach of democracy with revolution (probably *explosive*) and a finis incomputable to man—steady decay of all morality, political, social, individual, this once noble England getting more and more ignoble in every fibre of it.

As for the Liberals, John Bright admitted that three-fourths of those "who sat near him" were opposed to it and that, though for his part he valued it as the true ideal, he believed it would be wiser at present to draw the line a little above it.

In other words, the Tories were still living in the eighteenth century, while the Liberals, though desirous of paying homage to what they felt to be the spirit of the age, were very nervous at the pace at which they were being precipitated into the unknown. "It was one thing", as the Conservative onlooker remarks, "to aspire to the reputation of belonging to a party of popular sympathies; it was another to look household suffrage for the first time directly in the face".

Britain became a democracy in the half-century following 1867. When the formal process was completed—or practically completed—in 1917, opinion in all parts of the House was in general agreement, though no doubt then also there were some who would have wished "to draw the line a little above" that fixed by Mr. Lloyd George.

This change in opinion was little less than revolutionary, though we shall only realize the extent of the revolution when its full practical consequences begin to be drawn after the present war. Yet it came about silently and by imperceptible changes. Let us note a few of its landmarks, before turning to consider how, after the turn of the century, another conception of democracy began to steal into men's minds and to shed its influence over public affairs.

III.

The Education Act of 1870 brought a school within the reach of every child. Primary education was not compulsory till 1880 nor free till 1891, but the Act of 1870, following on the Reform Act of 1867, consecrated the principle that democracy should rest upon an educated electorate. But the new schools provided for the poor were very different from those attended by the rich, and this was commonly regarded as quite natural. In a society still divided into what Disraeli called "two nations" the unity of the teaching profession was an idea that was slow to take shape. As for the common school, such a notion had not yet appeared above the horizon in the generation of Mr. Gladstone. Nevertheless the spirit of democracy was astir and a few pioneers began to build bridges. frail and narrow structures at first, over the yawning gulf in English life. 1875 saw the first step towards the democratization of the older Universities by the inauguration of the University Extension movement at Cambridge. Nine years later another gesture followed, this time from Oxford, in the foundation of Toynbee Hall, the pioneer "Settlement". Rich and poor were to learn to live together: or rather, if we are to be exact, some of the rich were to live for a short time in a social laboratory in a poor district. As we look back to-day, the Settlement movement, as Arnold Toynbee and his contemporaries regarded it, seems artificial—not to say priggish. Indeed one could almost plot the curve of the progress of democracy in this country by studying the evolution of the Settlement. Toynbee Hall under the benign sway of that sturdy democrat, its present Warden, is a very different place from that frequented by Alfred Milner and other serious young Balliol men of his day.

In 1884 came the first hint of a challenge to the older seats of learning by the establishment of the Victoria University, composed of Colleges in Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds. Durham and London were indeed already in the field, but they had never been regarded as serious rivals to Oxford and Cambridge. Within a generation a whole new University system had come into being and the South Britons no longer needed to blush when they contemplated the four ancient Universities across the border, all founded before

1600—that is to say, before Scotland linked her fortunes with those of the "two nations" to the South of her.

But what are Universities if there are no schools to feed them? In 1902, by the second great Education Act, a nation-wide system of secondary education, under popular control, was brought into being, spanning the gulf between the schools of the people and the schools catering for the sons, and a few of the daughters, of ladies and gentlemen. The provision of free places for primary school pupils soon followed. Within the space of a comparatively few years the conception of the "educational ladder", narrow, precarious and isolating, product of the age of Samuel Smiles, was replaced by that of a broad highway of education with its starting-point in the primary school, or even the Nursery School (thanks to Margaret McMillan), and its terminus in the University, ancient or modern.

1904 marks another date in the record of education for democracy. Albert Mansbridge, with Charles Gore at his elbow, launched the Workers' Educational Association. This was an effort to span the gulf between the two nations at a different point, by establishing an organic connexion between the Universities and the system of voluntary organization which had now for some generations been a feature of British working-class life. The W.E.A. (the initials have become familiar) described itself as "a federation of educational and working-class organizations". In response to a demand presented by a deputation of its members to the University authorities, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford nominated seven representatives of the University to confer with an equal number of W.E.A. nominees to consider how the University could best meet this new need. This was the first "Joint Committee", forerunner of an institution that has now taken its place as a regular part of University organization, not only in this country but in some of the Dominions.

Thanks very largely to the W.E.A.—though other influences such as the Co-operative and Adult School movements should not be forgotten—Adult Education, a notion undreamt of by the generation of 1870, has become familiar to all who are concerned with the future of British democracy. It is now a commonplace that the citizen of a democracy should go on learning all his life, "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance". The words are Gladstone's: but it is a later generation which has come to recognize that the exercise of that vigilance demands a constant process of fresh thinking and self-criticism.

It is credibly recorded that the first tutor of a W.E.A. University Tutorial class, on returning from his first encounter with his students, was in despair at their respectful attitude during the discussion hour, so different from the intellectual fisticuffs to which

he was accustomed at Oxford. "What on earth am I to do?" he exclaimed, "these people believe everything I tell them". Here, from the lips of one who had learnt in the school of Socrates, is the voice of a leader—one kind of leader—of modern democracy. But it is not the voice or the technique of the Tribune. It would evoke a wry and pitying smile from Herr Goebbels. What are the masses there for except to believe what their leaders tell them? The Führer is always right.

IV.

The conception of democracy underlying the educational reforms that we have been outlining was the conception of Mill. But did Mill foresee the conditions under which his theory of democracy would be put to the test in the twentieth century? And was his notion of human nature comprehensive enough to enable him to understand the make-up of the modern citizen? To re-read the *Considerations on Representative Government* is to realize how slender were the foundations on which Mill's optimistic estimate of the future of democracy was based. To those who questioned whether it is not "fanciful" to expect the vote to become "a potent instrument of mental improvement" for the manual working class, he answers by adducing the striking success of democracy in the United States, with its high level of "ideas, tastes, and sentiments". But his ideas on American democracy, as he makes clear, were derived from de Tocqueville, whose book was already then a generation old—it was published in 1840—and bears little relation to the America of the period after the Civil War, still less to that of to-day. Bryce, who wrote half a century after de Tocqueville, knew the America of city bosses and Central and South European immigrants: but he, too, despite the under-current of doubt that runs through his estimate of modern democracy, is over-optimistic. "In the ideal democracy", he remarks in a passage which has become almost a classical text,

> every citizen is intelligent, patriotic, disinterested. His sole wish is to discover the right side in each contested issue, and to fix upon the best man among competing candidates. His common sense, aided by a knowledge of the constitution of his country, enables him to judge wisely between the arguments submitted to him, while his own zeal is sufficient to carry him to the polling booth.

This passage was picked out for critical comment in a book that will live in the history of English political theory as a necessary supplement to the nineteenth century conception of democracy—*Human Nature in Politics* by Graham Wallas. Wallas saw that Mill and Bryce, in their speculations on democracy, were dealing with a "political man" who was as unreal a personage as the "economic man" of economic theory and that they and those who

placed their confidence in them had overlooked a whole range of uncomfortable social facts. Wallas had fought elections, had been a house to house canvasser in a poor district in London, had kept his eyes and ears open for the talk of the man in the street—in fact, had practised "mass observation" before the term had been invented: and as a result of his experience, he realized how easy it was to apply to politics the technique of commercial advertising and how the conditions of twentieth century life were preparing the way for the Tribune.

Wallas was a political scientist—that is to say he had a close knowledge of the machinery of government. But he was also a sociologist and a psychologist: he followed up his *Human Nature in Politics* by a study of the *Great Society,* a book full of foreboding, published in the early months of 1914. He compelled us to see the citizen as a creature of instinct as well as a reasoning being, and to realize that, if the W.E.A. appealed to thousands, the *Daily Mail* and its compeers, which were now changing the face of British journalism, catered for millions. He brought to our notice the phenomena of crowd life set forth by Tarde and le Bon, who had penetrated into regions that Mill had never dreamt of exploring.

By 1920, under the impact of war-experience, all this had become only too familiar, and since then the danger has been, not that we should relapse into the comfortable optimism of Mill, but that we should be too tired and too disillusioned to undertake the comprehensive and many-sided effort to make democratic institutions work under twentieth century conditions.

V.

It would be interesting, if space permitted, to follow the theory and practice of that other variety of democracy, or pseudo-democracy, of which the Tribune or Führer is the emanation. It can be traced back to ancient Greece—is not the fate of Hitler foreshadowed in Plato's *Republic*?—and thence, through Rome, to the popular tyrants of the Italian republics. In recent times its greatest prophet has been Rousseau, with his theory of the concentration of Power in an authority representing the "General Will", and its first great practitioner was Napoleon, the originator of the modern technique of mass appeal. But its latest adepts have been able to use resources and devices undreamt of by Napoleon. The Revolution of Brumaire was a poor affair compared with the carefully planned campaign of political advertising, a combination of crime and pageantry, through which the German Tribune climbed into power. Once in command, the Tribune, now become Tyrant, though still dependent on the favour of "public opinion", can use all the levers of the modern state to condition it. First and foremost, he has the machine-gun, which checks the sudden explosion

of popular anger and has made obsolete the traditional "barricade" of the French Revolution. Then the wireless and the cinema, both in their infancy in 1914, enable him to keep his voice and his features continuously in his people's ears and eyes—a far more effective advertisement than the coin or the postage-stamp. This has greatly facilitated the working up of mass-feeling for the plebiscite—that ancient device of pseudo-democracy. It has also made easier the supersession of the elected assembly. The sovereign Parliament of orthodox democratic theory becomes nothing more than a tame chorus of "yes-men", assembled to applaud the Leader whilst he addresses his public and the world.

Thus, as the psychologists and sociologists of thirty years ago dimly foreshadowed, the twentieth century leader of the People can make what Rousseau called "the General Will", but what is, in practice, the arbitrary will of one man at the centre, supreme over every other individual will or group of wills in the community. He does not represent or harmonize or even listen to these other wills: he simply suppresses them, by blocking up every avenue to public discussion. He abolishes freedom of speech, freedom of public meeting, freedom of association and even, in a large measure, freedom of worship, packs the organs of local government, redraws ancient boundaries, carves up provinces and transplants populations, suppresses Trade Unions and sends women back to the kitchen—all in the name of democracy. He conditions the schools, the Universities and the learned societies. He breaks into the circle of private life, separating children from their parents and encouraging espionage in the home. In a word, the Leader's eye, his ear, and his hand are ubiquitous. The General Will is not only at the centre but everywhere.

VI.

The German Leader is courting failure, and his own particular system will not survive his defeat. That much we can foresee with confidence. But will his brand of democracy die with him? Of that we cannot be so sure. No doubt political advertising, like commercial advertising, carries with it its own antidote. People no longer blindly believe what either "the papers" or "the politicians" tell them. We are a far more critical and disillusioned nation than we were twenty years ago. But democracy cannot thrive on disillusionment. In the time that lies ahead of us we shall need a more active and courageous type of leadership than that to which we have hitherto been accustomed. Certainly our leaders should, in the American phrase, "have their ear to the ground", keeping in touch with public opinion through all the various organs for its expression. But just because they understand it and represent it, they should not shrink from educating and, if need be, correcting and contradicting it. An educated democracy is a community in

which men recognize one another's excellences. Mill in his day and generation had not realized the degree to which the post-Industrial Revolution state would stand in need of expert knowledge and, more than knowledge, psychological insight, in order to enable its citizens to lead the Good Life. We are seeing before our eyes in Central Europe something which might be described as the Organization of the Bad Life—the very negation of Goodness and Truth and Beauty. The Good Life, on its deeper side, as it is not necessary to emphasize in these pages, cannot be organized. But there are a hundred ways in which it can be encouraged—many of them ways as "unthinkable" as the organization of adult education or vocational guidance or the study of international affairs or family endowment were fifty years ago. The twenty years that separate us from the centenary of Mill's book will be the critical years for the survival of democracy as an effective form of government in the modern world. It is showing that it can muster the courage and the endurance which, to-day as always, are needed for victory in war. It has yet to show that it can produce the leadership that can bring about an enduring partnership between individual excellence and the service of the State.

THE ATONEMENT, GOD'S ACT.

By William E. Wilson, B.D.

Attempts are being made at the present day to re-establish a satisfaction doctrine of the work of Christ. Barth and Brunner and their fellow-workers proclaim a theory of penal substitution in much the same form as that prevalent among the Reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Others, while repudiating the term "satisfaction", lay stress on what they call the "God-ward aspect" or "God-ward reference" of the work of Christ. By these expressions they affirm their conviction that in dying on the Cross our Lord in some way acted directly upon God. Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson refers to this action throughout his book as "reparation"[1]. Dr. Vincent Taylor finds in our Lord's sacrifice, beyond "His perfect obedience to the Father's will", two elements, which can only be understood in a similar sense, Christ's "perfect submission to the judgment of God upon sin", and "His perfect penitence for the sins of men"[2].

Both writers thus maintain that Christ presented to God on behalf of man something which enabled God to deal with men, no longer on the basis of retributive justice, but on the basis of mercy. This is what "satisfaction" meant. The doctrine is more delicately expressed than is Anselm's, and it does not work with the questionable conception of God's honour, but it is "satisfaction", in the sense that it was something offered to God by Christ, which made forgiveness possible.

It is held by these writers that without such a "God-ward aspect" four intensely important moral and religious principles are not sufficiently stressed: man's sin and its terrible seriousness, man's inability to save himself, Christ's mediatorial work for man in the atonement, and the divine justice.

The object of this paper is to show that the facts of our Lord's ministry and death, as recorded in the Gospels, without any theorizing about them, give the strongest support to these four principles; and that these facts do not suggest any such God-ward aspect, as is maintained by these writers, but themselves constitute a revelation of God's atoning love: that in short we have in our Lord's death on the Cross, not an enigma which must be explained by some theory of divine appeasement, satisfaction or "God-ward aspect", but a revelation of divine reconciling love. Just as in the Old Testament revelation is by no means only a matter of prophetic

[1] *The Redeemer.*
[2] *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 307 f.

words and legal codes, but is also seen in God's providential guidance of Israel, so also here, but more clearly, more concisely and more dramatically, we see God in action. We see God in Christ saving men, God revealing Himself to men, and at the same time, and by the same means, showing them themselves and their sin. And because what we see is God in action in a world of sinners, the other side of that revelation is men's fanatical opposition to the will of God and to their own true interests.

Beyond that it seems desirable to show how these facts of the gospel story give an adequate basis for two theories of atonement which were almost universally held before the satisfaction doctrine gained a firm hold of the Church, and for another, which, so far as I am aware, has only arisen in modern times, and that these three together are not three conflicting theories, but one, the obvious meaning of the Cross in the light of the teaching of Jesus Christ our Lord.

I do not propose to discuss the interpretation of New Testament passages by which Dr. Sparrow Simpson and Dr. Vincent Taylor support their views. These are the ordinary proof-texts for penal substitution, and in my judgment, on their traditional exegesis, point to that doctrine rather than to theirs. I discussed all of these in *The Problem of the Cross*[3] and showed the strong probability, in some cases amounting to certainty, that the current interpretations were based on misunderstanding, and that most of such proof-texts for "satisfaction" rather point to the moral influence view.

I.

Jesus Christ was crucified by the Roman Governor of Judaea, at the demand of the Jewish Sanhedrin, as a Messianic claimant. This on the face of it suggests no action by Christ upon God, but an act of the Jewish leaders, through Pilate and the Roman soldiery, against Christ and, through Him, against God. It was then no "reparation" for human sin, but an outstanding instance of sin. Nor is the element of "reparation" visible in the events which led to the Cross, nor in those that resulted from it. The former consist of the ministry of Jesus from the Baptism by John to Calvary. It is impossible to give a complete summary, but the following stand out. First is the background of it all. At least from the time of His baptism Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, though the claim was not made public till the end. But the Messiah, as He understood the office, was not a conquering king. Behind this conviction, and its source, was intimacy with God and complete trust in Him.

The whole ministry of Jesus was dominated by three closely related themes: The Kingdom of God is already here; God is

3 Published by James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1929.

Father, all may trust absolutely to His care; a completely new outlook on life is needed. His activity consisted in preaching, teaching, and healing the sick, the last being a manifestation of divine love which seems almost to have been forced upon Him. His preaching and teaching emphasized on the one hand the love of God, which goes out to seek the lost "until He find it", the prime necessity of trust in God as the foundation of life, love as the one commandment, and free forgiveness on genuine repentance and the will to forgive others; on the other hand a foreboding, amounting to certainty, that the rejection of His message could only lead to disaster. (Part of this was fulfilled in A.D.70; but the fulfilment is still going on.)

Three things, all essential parts of His mission, brought Him into conflict with the Jewish leaders, and may therefore be regarded as the cause of their planning His death: the teaching that God's love was to all, that it was not the perquisite of righteous Jews, who kept the law, but that it went out to sinners and enemies, and that therefore a like love was incumbent upon men who would know God as their Father; a quiet assumption of the right to criticize and amend the law; and a strange attitude of tolerance and even liking for the outcast, the disreputable, the "sinner", combined with severe criticism of the religious leaders, and indignation at hardness of heart.

The whole impact of Jesus was not simply in His teaching, but in the authority with which He spoke and acted, and the love to all, especially to the poor, the afflicted and sinners, which He shewed. Scarcely anything in it all was like what had been expected of the Messiah. Yet those most intimate with Him, because of that combination of goodness, authority, and knowledge of God, recognized Him as such. The religious and political leaders saw the same facts—or at least their outward expression, for they gave themselves no opportunity for deeper knowledge—and came to the opposite conclusion. This man is a dangerous fanatic: He must be killed.

In the latter part of His ministry, if not earlier, Jesus became certain that the completion of His work would involve His death. The Messiah must suffer. Why? Clearly to realize the Kingdom of God, which in His first preaching He had proclaimed as already here.

Throughout this whole survey of the facts of Jesus's ministry, not one item suggests that His death was required by God as a "reparation". The inference has indeed been drawn from a reported word here and there, but it is at best a precarious inference, contrary to the general tenor of His life and teaching. The Cross, seen as the culmination of His life, was man's deed in rejecting

God. To see in it a "reparation" offered to God is to let a questionable inference from two or three sayings, which are capable of other and more probable interpretation, weigh against the obvious facts that preaching, teaching, and doing good had not brought about the μετάνοια (repentance) without which the Kingdom could not be realized, and that Jesus, recognizing this, saw that His death, the death of the Messiah, was needed to bring "the grace of repentance to the world"[4].

What then of the results of the death of Christ? These are easily summarized, but they cannot be understood or explained apart from the Resurrection. That Christ rose from the dead, appeared to His disciples and assured them of His victory over death and of His presence with them through the Holy Spirit, are facts without which the existence of the Christian Church would be inexplicable. What the death and resurrection did was to produce first in the disciples, then in their converts, and since then in ever widening streams all over the world, a genuine and developing μετάνοια through which men entered the Kingdom, beginning actually to trust their lives to God and to be ruled by Him. This is clear on every page of *Acts* and the Epistles. The work of Christ had reconciled many to God. They were "redeemed", that is, "released"[5], from bondage to sin and evil spirits by Him. They were "in Christ" and entered into "a new creation" in Him. They were "being transformed by the renewing of their minds". In them the Kingdom of God had begun to come.

What had happened was no alteration in God's attitude, but the beginning of an alteration in that of men. In the death of Jesus the love of God was seen as never before, and that love produced its natural effect. It induced men to trust their lives to God. It produced μετάνοια. Dr. James Moffatt has pointed out, "that apart from the redeeming action of the Lord Jesus Christ the early Church evidently saw no ground whatsoever for believing in a God of love"[6]. In the Epistles the love of God is almost always mentioned in connection with the death of Christ. The fundamental need of men to see the love of God and so to trust in Him and have His love reproduced in them, which was the burden of Christ's message, was only realized through His death. That death was the result of the repudiation of His message, and became its substantiation.

In the Cross, then, Christ bore the sin of men. Their sin killed Him. He died for sin in the direct sense that man's sin was the cause of His death, and His death was the cause of its removal in the only possible way, by bringing men back to God.

[4] 1 Clem., VII.

[5] "Redeemed" as used in both Old and New Testament is generally simply a synonym for "released." See *The Problem of the Cross*, Chap. V.

[6] *Love in the New Testament*, 5.

II.

These facts of the Gospel story shine in their own light and are the climax of God's revelation of Himself in history. Every satisfaction or God-ward aspect doctrine practically denies this, by stating that behind this revelation, which can be seen, lies a hidden transaction in God Himself, an alteration in His attitude to men, willed indeed by God, but made effective by the work of Christ. It is obvious, if this is true, that we are dependent for all knowledge of it, no longer on the work of Christ itself, where it is not to be seen, but on some divine communication of super-mundane facts.

Those who advocate "God-ward reference" not only hold that such a revelation of super-mundane facts has been given (a position which I have sufficiently dealt with in *The Problem of the Cross*), but that without its assertion of Christ's action upon God the above mentioned moral values could not be maintained.

We must therefore enquire if this is so, and in particular ask the following questions of the facts of the Gospel story:—

(1) Whether and in what way they show the sinfulness of sin? (2) How they emphasize the office of Christ as mediator? (3) How far they make clear that man cannot save himself, but is dependent from first to last upon God? (4) How it stands with regard to divine justice?

(1) The review of the facts of the Gospel does not show the sinfulness of sin by exhibiting the divine condemnation or punishment of it falling upon Christ. What is seen is rather sin in its results, and sin where it was unsuspected. It was the sin of respectable, moral, and in some cases deeply religious, people—for there were Pharisees in the Sanhedrin that condemned Him—which brought Jesus to the Cross. At once we see pride, egotism, self-centredness as essential sin. There it was in the solemn assembly of the Jewish people, represented as patriotism, political expediency, belief in divine favouritism, self-righteousness. That was the cause of the crucifixion. That killed the Son of God. The only nation in the world who knew the one true God slew His Son. That is the condemnation of sin, general sin, human sin. If the most truly religious of all peoples did that, then the whole human race are sinners—separated from God by their pride and self-sufficiency.

That is the judgment of the Cross. It is a direct revelation of sin, and as a revelation its condemnation.

(2) The facts of the Gospel present Christ as God's final revelation. But the word "revelation" is too inactive. In Christ God acts upon man and comes into human life to heal the separation. The action is all from God through Christ. It is a one-way street because man can do nothing for himself, except respond to God,

and he cannot do that until the love of God grips him. As these gospel facts show man's sin as resistance to God, they also show it as feebleness and stupidity. The very disciples of Jesus could not understand, and at the end forsook Him and fled. God in Christ had to awaken the possibility of response in man. Even for the disciples this was not fully achieved without the death of Christ.

When the awakening begins, when men begin to respond to the love of God, the street becomes a two-way street. Christ leads them to the Father, enables them to dedicate their lives to Him. The Crucified is also the Risen One, and as such the continual Mediator between God and men, bringing God's love to them, enabling them to trust in God.

(3) That man cannot save himself has been suggested by the foregoing. The whole story shows it. It is also the basal fact of Christian experience. Strong and determined people may, indeed, by pure effort of will, reform this and that item in their conduct. But such reforms leave the central fact of sin untouched and even in a worse case. Self-reform builds up the central stronghold of revolt from God. It strengthens the usurper. The Gospel shows God in Christ giving Himself to men. They are being saved as they sincerely begin to give themselves to Him, and they can only do that as He stretches across the separation and takes hold of them.

(4) But what about Justice? Must not a righteous God punish sin? Can we be satisfied with the idea of God's love, which receives sinners yet does nothing to punish their sin? To these questions the time-honoured answer of critics of satisfaction doctrines is that punishment visited on the innocent does not make for justice, and, indeed, is supremely unjust. That objection to the view that Christ was punished for our sins has never been satisfactorily met. But it does not go far enough. The questions still remain. The true answer is given in Christ. One of the most remarkable and, to His opponents scandalous, features of His ministry is expressed in the words, "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them". Our Lord did not practise that justice which separates itself from sinners, condemns and punishes. The reason for this is obvious; He welcomed sinners in order to save them from sin. He could indeed be indignant at hardness of heart, as only One whose life was ruled by love could be. He denounced some sinners, but only such as "trusted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others". Such indignation and denunciation was the expression of pure love—a part of the "seeking the lost until he find it".

This attitude of Jesus has a meaning which is strangely overlooked. It means that love, ἀγάπη, care for others, is not secondary to justice or holiness, but is the great positive, creative power of

which justice and holiness are only subsidiary, and, in their separating and punishing aspects, negative, constituents. If then in this, as in everything, Jesus Christ reveals God, the sentence "God is love" is more definitely, completely, and universally true than is often admitted. The ideas of Holiness—God's separation from sin, and justice—His punishment of wrongdoers, had a valued place in bringing men to see their sin, repent and turn to God, but they could not save. Only God's love can save. For only as a man recognizes that can he trust his life to God, can he be reconciled to God and so receive divine power.

Look at the question from another point of view. The natural life of man is communion with God, dedication to God and obedience to God. But this natural life is not natural to any human being. The natural has become unnatural. That is the measure of human sin. Man is separated from God. Being separated from God and unnatural, everything he does goes wrong. He is on the way of death instead of the way of life. Habit, environment, and second nature are so strong that he cannot put himself right.

What can be done to put him right? The facts of the Gospel give the answer: God in Christ comes down into man's state of sin and misery to save him. That saving in its fulness is nothing less than bringing the sinner into a life of dedication to God and obedience to God. Because of man's opposition to God, Christ died. The opposition itself killed Him, and thereby made clear the amazing love of God in a way that nothing else could have done. But bringing men back to God, to depend upon Him, and obey Him, is re-establishing the natural state of things, ruined by sin, and is in that sense an act of justice. It is not the negative justice which punishes sin, but the positive and creative justice which puts an end to sin and establishes goodness. The Love of God which met the sin of men in the Cross of Christ is thus the direct means of justice in the fullest sense.

The atonement, then, as we see it in the Gospel story, is God's appeal to sinful men to return to Him. It is presented first in word and action, and then when these are rejected, the very opposition, which rejects, makes possible a fuller presentation of the love of God in suffering and death. When we begin to see what these facts mean, man's sin and inability to save himself stand out as appalling facts. His separation from God is seen as rebellion against unselfish love. God's Love in Christ shines from the Cross. We realize that there is one Mediator between God and man. And we see divine creative justice, which recreates ruined lives, and can in the end produce that perfect justice, which is the Kingdom of God.

III.

This review of the Gospel facts lends itself well to the support and strengthening of two well-known, but somewhat neglected, theories of atonement.

It entirely agrees with the theory of Abelard that all is the work of God's love and that that love works as a moral appeal to men to turn to God, a theory which, while first definitely formulated by Abelard, pervades much earlier thinking. In Abelard's view there is nothing untrue, and every theory of atonement has recognized that he stated part of the truth. But it is complained that his theory lacked an objective element.

When we see the whole life, ministry, and teaching of Christ as one continuous appeal for μετάνοια, and see the death as the consequence of the rejection of that appeal, and the means of its intensification, the Abelardian view gains that objective basis which otherwise it lacked. All is God's work, God's conflict with man's sin, God conquering by love to the uttermost.

Similarly the theories which held the field in the Christian Church long before "Satisfaction" was propounded, those associated with the name of Irenaeus, are capable of combination with this factual view. Not that we can, or need, accept all the developments of the ideas of Redemption from the devil, or Recapitulation. Any bargain with the powers of evil must be denied, as Anselm rightly indicated. But, in the view of many interpreters, Irenaeus himself never taught the bargain theory. To him, as to Paul[7], "redemption" was metaphor, the synonym of "release". "Release" from the power of evil is one of the greatest and most constantly experienced of all features of the Christian life. That in some way the death of Christ struck a vital blow at the powers of evil may well be a fact. There is anyway nothing contrary to sound reason, to moral standards, or to Christian experience in it. How it could do so, and what actually took place, may be left as a divine secret. The fact of "release" is known to everyone who trusts in Christ.

Recapitulation, too, though not to be accepted in exactly the form presented by Irenaeus, has in it elements which may be built into this factual statement of the Atonement. Christ did go through human experience, conquering where man had failed. Christ did refound the human race, gone wrong in Adam. Christ does bring individuals into that union with God which is Life, and He did become man that we might be made divine (*i.e.*, be permeated with the divine life). We cannot believe to-day that this action of His had in it the magical elements, which seem to have appealed to the men of Irenaeus's day. We may question whether the idea of a

[7] I have given adequate grounds for the statement that for Paul "redemption" simply means "release" in *The Problem of the Cross*, Chap. V.

change in the substance of humanity exactly expresses what happened. But we know that by entering into our estate and suffering for us, Christ has brought a new birth, a new creation, to countless individuals. And this review of the Gospel facts shows how He did it and why it was necessary.

Finally, the facts of the Gospel suggest a view of the meaning of atonement which has been put forward in the present century by a number of writers[8]. Jesus not only refused to be a conquering king, He deliberately took a method of establishing His Messiahship, which was the exact opposite. In allowing Himself to be killed without making any attempt to save Himself, He was in His own person meeting evil exactly in the way which He had advocated, in the words "Resist not the evil-doer". In the death of Jesus we see the supreme example of fighting evil with good, conquering by love. Evil is strong and entrenched in the citadel of man's soul; reproof, example, and expressions of goodwill are feeble before it. The love that is strong enough to suffer and die for its enemies may conquer them. Nothing else can. That is part of the idea expressed by atonement as non-resistance. Another element in it goes much deeper. It is this, that God, the Almighty, does not oppose evil with injury, but lets it go its own way, so that men, His children, may thereby at last see that evil is evil by its results in destruction. Not that He stands aside and does nothing. By His Light within, the striving of His Spirit with man, and by inspired prophetic word and wise counsel of law-giver and sage, He points to the good and condemns the evil, and in the climax of His revelation in the person of His Son, He enters into the conflict, bearing with and for men the evil they do. If an enforced and fear-inspired obedience could be acceptable to God, the way of punishment and compulsion might have been enough. But such would at best have produced a grudging submission, a disloyal loyalty. The loyalty of pure responsive trust can only arise from such a sight of God's love as cannot be denied. This, the Cross of Christ, exhibits when seen as the inevitable outcome of His ministry in a world of self-centred, pride-inflated men. The message of God's love needed the non-resistant death of His Son to conquer men's hardness of heart.

IV.

To sum up: the Atonement seen in the whole work of Christ from Jordan to Calvary, is a revelation that God is love, and thereby a moral appeal to men to turn to Him, and live as His children. Abelard is right. It is the entry into human life of the Son of God in order that men may become partakers of the divine nature. The

[8] Among others by W. Fearon Halliday, J. R. Coates, C. J. Cadoux, A. T. Cadoux, Edward Grubb, and the present writer.

main theme of recapitulation as Irenaeus taught it is right. It is redemption from the power of evil, whether that be thought of as our own sin, the general sin of mankind, or the influence of spirits of evil. Again in essentials Irenaeus is right. Its method was love to the uttermost, demonstrated by the most searching of all tests, a lonely death of ignominy and torture endured in complete faith in God and love to men. It is atonement by non-resistance.

All this is directly seen in the facts of the Gospel and its results in the lives of those who respond to it. It is confirmed by words on almost every page of the New Testament, even by most of those which have been traditionally regarded as proof-texts of penal substitution. On the other hand, all forms of penal substitution, satisfaction, and God-ward aspect are, from their very nature, incapable of being directly seen and experienced by men; were first propounded mainly on the basis of theological and philosophical presuppositions unlikely to appeal to men to-day, and are supported by precarious inferences from scriptural passages, all of which possibly, most probably, and many certainly, were never intended by their writers to have any such meaning.

Finally, it is a Gospel that can be preached and evokes response to-day, for it is one message, not two. The Gospel of Jesus and the Gospel about Jesus are not, as since the days of Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums* has often been assumed, two alternative Gospels, but necessary parts of the one Gospel.

THE "MADRAS" REPORTS.

By Kenneth G. Grubb.

The literary records of conferences are proverbially dull, and it is, presumably, incumbent upon a reviewer to recognize this as generally true, and then to maintain that those which lie before him form a notable exception. The experienced are, however, well accustomed to this gambit and, being hardened and totally immunized against the conference habit, cling the closer to their prejudice. To refuse oysters because they have a forbidding exterior is, however, defective gastronomic strategy.

The Madras series consists of seven volumes whose subjects are broadly indicated by their titles. They represent the labour of many minds of many nations and many church traditions. If the material is analysed by processes of composition, it is found to have been contributed in four ways. Some papers were written beforehand, as a result of careful and extended studies. They were in the hands of delegates before the Conference; their main principles were discussed at it; and they are now included in the proceedings. Other papers were written since the conference to cover subjects which were raised at it and which seemed to demand further consideration. Other chapters consist of official findings reached by the different sections and ratified or modified in plenary sessions; and others again are addresses or pronouncements whose inclusion was justified by their importance. Clearly, contributions from such different sources are hardly comparable for their quality: the strategy which has for years been discussed at the staff college has a special kind of importance; the report of a reconnaissance squadron may, however, be excitingly significant. What the pronouncements of an international body lose in definiteness they may gain in impressiveness. The reader of these volumes, therefore, will do well to bear in mind the different processes which have been followed in their compilation.

On the face of it, your hardened conference-goer will have some reason in complaining that it is not worth his while to take these volumes too seriously. The subject which runs through them is that of the Conference itself, the Universal Church, its growth, message, and activities. It can be maintained, with a compassable show of good sense, that Madras (1938) does not hold the breadth of interest of Jerusalem (1928). The latter was more concerned with the relation of the Church's message to the great problems of the age. Christianity and the race problem, Christianity and the profit-motive, Christianity and the social order generally, were subjects on which valuable pronouncements were there made.

These problems lend themselves to both eloquent and weightily comprehensive handling. It is not easy to write a glittering and impressive essay on the rottenness of the deacon's rice, which is how the problem of self-support may strike the local congregation. The meaning of rice for the existence of the Church was, however, a problem with which Madras was actually concerned, and no one who understands in the least how vital it is to the self-support of the younger churches will suppose it to be either irrelevant or dull. The training of the ministry is certainly of urgent importance, but a minister, trained for the pulpit, should not be starved into a grave.

Moreover the volumes are deeply interesting because they unfold the mechanism of a new order. These men—Azariah's and W. Y. Chen's—are the Faradays and Wattses of a new science of a life. The truth on which this science is based is, indeed, that which we have heard from the beginning, that God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. But until the Church in the West awoke more fully to the fact that what was light in Peckham Rye or Bolton might conceivably also be illuminating in China or India, it was not possible to develop a Christian doctrine of international relations, or indeed to perceive clearly any of the principles which would animate a world Christian order as a conceivable substitute for the present disorder. We are, indeed, very far from that yet, but the emergence of the Church is pointing the way.

Now the Madras volumes bring out very clearly what is really involved in building up the universal church. To start with, it seems fairly evident that we often use the word "international" as applied to movements, in two different senses. Let us assume that there stand at Geneva the headquarters (three rooms on the first floor) of the International League of Beauty Worshippers with a very efficient secretary and two lady-clerks. Correspondence is carried on with 1,500 affiliated units all over the world. Here is a case of a common loyalty to an ideal, and even of a common culture —beauty culture; and an international beauty conference, a veritable Tambaram, is held every ten years. Yet such an organization, and there are many of them, is manifestly "international" in quite a different sense from the Church. I pass over the question of whether the Church should really be termed international, to stress the fact that it differs from a mere international league by being an exclusive community. As such its loyalty is an exclusive one in a far more rigid sense than that of our imaginary league. A man can be a beauty-worshipper *and* a grinder of the poor, an approver of anti-semitism, or a worshipper of the Emperor. A member of the Church cannot. But whether he can or cannot depends very largely on how far the common implications of the faith have been worked out, so that a common loyalty to Jesus Christ is progressively inter-

preted as a common discipline of life, freely accepted and abundantly creative through the very limitations which it imposes. The Madras reports reveal the fascinating picture of the Christian community of East and West struggling to give concrete interpretations in terms of its own inner life and discipline to its universal loyalty. By defining scope, it defines incompatibilities, and asserts, for all to see, its distinctive character.

Furthermore, perhaps at no period of recent history has such keen interest been shown in the kind of social and political organization necessary to eliminate war and remove the evils that are born from ambitious and competitive nationalisms. Some strong minds have dedicated themselves to the elaboration of such schemes, seeking to avoid the enthusiasms of the utopias, and striving to find in some existing or possible tendencies, a hope for international reorganization. But it is never sufficient merely to formulate outlines or define ideals. The Stoic philosophers knew well that a common loyalty implied a measure of common law; and to-day we require, further, a common control of resources, and a common conviction as to the essentials of citizenship and the liberties which men may arrogate to themselves or the disciplines which they may impose upon others. The Madras reports give a picture of the various component parts of a world community seeking by planning and thought, as well as by trial and practice, to move in this direction. They portray upon a canvas at present limited, but of infinite significance, the lineaments of a new civilization, which holds the promise of being Christian in a sense that no civilization yet has been. If any demonstration of this is needed, let the reader turn to the report on the Christian home contained in Volume IV.

We may add to these general considerations one more of no less relevance. These volumes bear out the truly representative character of the Conference. When we want to know what leading Indian Christians think of the economic basis of the Indian Church or what a Japanese Christian has to say on the general outlook for Christianity in his country, no source more authoritative than these volumes can be recommended. Similarly it will easily be discerned that the central doctrinal problem discussed, that of the nature and content of the Christian revelation, is dealt with by minds which reflect cultures very different from that of the West. In its early days, Christianity came to terms with Hellenism; to-day we find the absorbing picture of a similar process on several different and simultaneous fronts. What is lost in systematic thoroughness of presentation in the limited space of a few volumes is to some degree compensated by a penetratively illuminating treatment showing that the light is often seen at its brightest against surrounding darkness. The very process of research which preceded the Conference is itself clearly related to and

expressive of the needs and views of the younger churches. It was done, in large part, not by the visitations of experts, but by the guidance of such; and a large number of Christian institutions on the field actively co-operated through the directed, local research of their staff and members. The results are clearly reflected in the cogent relevance of the studies.

It would be tedious and superficial to recapitulate all the subjects discussed: it must suffice to draw attention to some of the principal ones. The first volume, under the title *The Authority of the Faith,* contains a series of essays, headed by a paper by Dr. Kraemer which is to some extent a brief re-statement of the views which he has elaborated in *The Christian Message to the Non-Christian World.* The remaining chapters are closely concerned with the issues raised in his book. The present reviewer, being a layman, is not competent to pronounce on these questions. The nature of the Christian revelation is here revealed as the dominant question for many leaders of the younger churches, and for many who are associated with the missionary movement in the West, owing to the decisive challenge which it contains. On the view held of the nature of the revelation contained in non-Christian religions depend also two deductions of immediate consequence to the work of evangelism and of building up the Church: first, the attitude which should rule the Christian approach to members of other faiths, and secondly, the extent to which the process of "syncretism" is liable to develop and is desirable or not. On the first, it is sufficient to say that the Christian attitude to non-Christian faiths has already undergone a vast modification and deepening during the last thirty years. On the second, it is fairly clear to the present writer that a certain degree of syncretism is not only desirable but inevitable. It is difficult to see why Christianity should not come to terms with the non-Christian religious cultures of the East any more than it did with Greek culture and Latin civilization. But it must never be forgotten that its *progress* will mainly depend on somewhat different factors, namely the simplicity of its message and the degree to which it can continually strip off such syncretisms and unite itself to fresh co-efficients. This, perhaps, is hardly brought out with sufficient force in the volume under consideration.

Both Dr. Kraemer and the "Findings" of the Conference develop clearly the essential point that all religious insight, whether Christian or non-Christian, must be tested by the words and deeds of Jesus Christ. Revelation, however, remains something qualitatively different from ordinary religious insight. It involves, and Professor Farmer develops this point briefly but attractively, a transaction of a personal nature, and is thus a term of relationship. If this be so, it is certainly impossible to localize and define with satisfying correctness where and how such a transaction has taken

place. There must always remain some area of the inner life of persons in regard to which perception must necessarily be presumptive rather than authoritative.

When we study what "Madras" has to say on the life and activity of the Church we are faced with a vast variety of recorded experiences and variant methods. We may start from the subject of evangelism, being the process by which the Church offers the good news to the world. Perhaps the least valuable part of this volume is the assemblage of definitions of the term "evangelism". If this aggregation of exactitudes reveals anything, it is that the scope and application of the term, rather than its actual equivalence, need examination. But this cannot be done by experimental definitions, for there is no guarantee that fifty definitions of an atom will reveal more than one. Fortunately, the series of papers describing different types of evangelism and the activity of the Church in them give a broad and detailed picture of the vital part which evangelism holds in the Christian world and outlook. An essay of particular interest is that by Dr. Knak on German Evangelical Missions. For here is developed the German conception of the *Volk* and *Volkstum* in relation to the social organization of primitive communities coming gradually or suddenly into the light of the Gospel. We owe it to German Missions that this conception of the *Volk* which has been made to serve ends that are utterly unworthy, and ambitions which we cannot but resist, has been purified from its disagreeable accretions and brought into fruitful subservience to the purpose of evangelization. As a secondary deduction from Dr. Knak's paper, it becomes clear that the fragmentary individualism of western society is far from being a consequence of the Reformation, but is rather a mistaking of an imaginary religious self-determination for the liberty of the Christian man. Having disposed briefly of this and other subjects, Dr. Knak turns to discuss the missionary thought of to-day and the dialectic theology. Here he raises, from a somewhat different angle, questions which are more intensively discussed by Dr. Kraemer and his critics.

Evangelism as an isolated subject offers evident difficulties for discussion, yet there is a real need to measure the area covered by the term. There are references in these pages to medical evangelism, social evangelism, the larger evangelism and other types. It is all a little reminiscent of the man who once was poor and now is rich and who still insists in referring to his country seat, his villa and his town house in each case as "my humble abode". The younger Churches are pursuing many Christian objectives to-day; these need not however be equated with evangelism; they can with greater significance be related to it; and their evangelistic value can with profit be analysed in each case and with differing results.

The chapter contributed by the Rev. Alexander McLeish on the unfinished task is both depressing and challenging. In spite of a rapidity of advance which has no parallel in Christian history, the solid resistance offered to Christianity not only by Islam but by Buddhism is here explicitly emphasized. The progressive dimming of scattered lamps in Central Asia as Soviet penetration creeps onward is a measure of the new force against which the Church is pitting its resources. Meanwhile we are warned that many of the sixty millions of the depressed classes and aboriginals in India may well drift into other religious groups during the next ten years if not effectively reached with the Gospel. On the other hand "even the unoccupied fields (of India) have been penetrated by many Christian influences". The advancing Church must fight a battle on two fronts; before it lies this great battlefield, and it is weakened in the rear by a widespread pervasiveness of sub-Christian beliefs and standards, by the hostility, in some cases, of the State, and by the self-sufficiency of the modern mind. Yet it is called to advance with all its forces by the centre.

The evangelistic task of the Church is closely connected with its economic basis. There was much evidence at Madras of the train of argument which repudiated the importance of self-support, and urged that its advocacy is a foe to militant and enterprising evangelism. If the Church is a fellowship of giving and receiving, then to isolate any unit of it and require of it to be self-supporting is in a certain sense a fallacy. In passing, this argument naturally has an appeal for harassed leaders among the younger churches, desperate for funds. Nevertheless the psychological, and also the spiritual value of self-support is considerable, and the general argument that expansion cannot indefinitely depend upon the generosity of often hard-pressed communities in the West is irrefutable. The question is closely tied up with that of church organization and government, Christian teaching and inspiration, the wealth of the community in general, and the share of the Church in it. The especial value of the Madras studies is that, for the first time, they give a clear picture of the economic roots of the community and of the church membership, and of the different systems of giving and of church finance which have been developed. This is supplemented by studies of self-supporting churches in different parts of the world.

Throughout these valuable studies emerges the sense of the soil. The vast majority of the members of the younger churches are directly dependent upon the village and land for their life. Christianity in coming to the East first took root in towns and cities, as it did in the Roman Empire. This has given it a running start. But it has already pushed far into the country districts, where it has had forcibly to come to grips with the poverty of the eastern

farmer. The picture given in these studies of Christianity in action is one of engrossing interest. The newer churches are struggling with a problem in which the guidance which the older ones can give them is comparatively limited. But it is important to perceive how the meaning of the soil is here analysed, not as something sacred in itself, or as giving to its possessors any sacrosanct national privileges, but rather as sacred to God. Not only is the life of man thereby sustained, but the fellowship of His people is made possible, and each act of collective worship becomes a testimony to the perpetual generous giving of God which makes His people joyful in His praises.

The spiritual and economic life of the Church being in the full way of development, there emerge a host of questions, some of which are acutely concerned with its relations with the community, while others are more closely questions of its inner life and organization. The findings of seven of the sections of the Conference are brought together in one volume in order to throw light on them. Those who peruse it may, perhaps, be surprised that the burning subject of Church union did not receive greater prominence. The Conference, however, was not constituted to discuss this in any special sense. There does emerge an immensely strong conviction that progress has been disappointingly slow. There is more than a hint that our brethren of the younger churches are awaiting a lead from ourselves. But the competing interests and motives are clearly sensed, if not expressed. Which is the greater ideal? A world-wide Anglicanism, or Methodism, or Lutheranism? Or a united Church in all-India, as a unit in the world-wide Church? The magnitude of the subject seems to the layman to be in inverse ratio to the weight of the objections urged. In other words, the larger the final objective looms up, the smaller do the objections appear.

Many topics must necessarily be passed over in silence here, but reference must be made to the attitude of the State to the Church, evidence of which was brought to Madras from different countries. This challenge, now commonly recognized in Russia and Germany, is acute in Korea, Manchukuo, and Central Asia; while in a different form, it intimately and adversely affects the status of the Church in such countries as Turkey, and in the Muslim world generally. In yet other regions Protestant minorities or missions are placed at a distinct disadvantage by legislation promoted by Roman Catholic influences, while Catholics themselves are free from let or hindrance in Protestant countries. At some points the subject links up closely with that of the Oxford Conference, but the treatment of it at Madras was not so thorough, although the understanding of the issue was equally clear if less comprehensive. On the other hand, the actual situations reported not only instantly reveal the threat that is being brought to an expansionist

Christianity, but are a startling challenge to the complacency as much as to the sympathy of all Christians.

Nothing has yet been said of the attitude of the Conference to the relations between mission and church. This subject was, in fact, treated from several different angles, and as it emerges in the reports, it is very far from being a motive for acute dissensions and jealousies. The reciprocity of the sense of mission was clearly recognized. The missionary labours of the modern Church in East and West are a cross-fertilization of spiritual experience. The sense of mission thus becomes the servant of the sense of fellowship which ever grows into richer experience watered by the joys and sorrows of these mortal years of service and drawing fresh life from the Father of lights from Whom cometh every good and perfect gift, whether in Asia or Europe.

What, perhaps, is not sufficiently conveyed by the letter of the reports is the spirit that informs the whole, but this requires a medium somewhat different from the pen of a minute-writer. At times it was not altogether an exaggeration to catch a distant glimpse of the Church gradually realizing on earth Dante's vision of Paradise, in the form of a redeemed community gladly rendering willing obedience to Him Whom to serve is eternal peace, though the storms be raging. At other times, the vigour and sternness of the conflict became evident: behind and through the chorus of praise there were solemn organ-tones, the music of the martyr's way. By absences from the Conference, as much as by the reports of those present at it, and the messages printed in these volumes, it was clear that the younger churches had not been slow to inspire their own pioneers of self-sacrifice of whom the world has too few.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By Prof. H. H. Rowley, D.D.

The Old Testament is to-day either largely misunderstood or gravely neglected. On the one hand there are people who regard it primarily as a cryptic key of the ages, and who study it in the belief that they can predict the future by its means. On the other hand there are people who react strongly against this, and who prefer to regard it as an outworn remnant of the past, and there are not wanting those who would eliminate it from the Bible of the Church. Between these groups there are vast numbers of people who are perplexed by the Old Testament, who fail to understand it, and who on that account ignore it. They are familiar with some of the stories of the Old Testament, with a few of the Psalms, and with a few of the outstanding passages from the Prophets. But the rest is an uncharted sea to them, and they rarely embark upon its waters. They have a vague feeling that modern scholarship has made it impossible to understand the Bible as our fathers understood it, but no idea of the new understanding that scholarship makes possible.

There is, therefore, urgent need that all teachers of Scripture, whether teachers of young or of old, should set themselves to constructive teaching, to enable their hearers to gain some clear idea of the meaning and message of the Old Testament, and to grasp the general principles in the light of which any particular passage is to be studied.

Especially urgent is the need for a re-definition of the inspiration of the Old Testament. For the older view of its character and meaning was based on the conception of inspiration our fathers held, and those who still cling to that view fear that modern scholarship aims to reduce the Old Testament to the level of a common book, in which no voice of God is heard; while many of those who would eliminate the Old Testament from the Christian Bible would appear to adopt such a position, and to think that because it is but an ordinary book, it does not deserve our special study. It is therefore desirable to insist, at the outset, that while our view of the nature of inspiration differs from that of our fathers, we may still firmly recognize the reality of inspiration. This, however, lays on us the obligation to state what we mean by inspiration, and to provide some philosophy of revelation to replace that which we have rejected. The present paper does not attempt the ambitious project of providing an adequate philosophy of revelation, but seeks only

to prepare the way by some clarification of thought on the preliminary issues involved.

I.

It used to be thought that God was solely responsible for every statement in the Bible, and that its divine origin guaranteed it against all error. The human authors were conceived of as passive instruments in the hands of God, acting wholly under His control. On such a view, the least error or contradiction becomes of grave importance, for if the Bible is wholly of God, its complete inerrancy should be beyond challenge. But no one can read carefully the books of *Samuel* and *Kings* and the books of *Chronicles* without finding a whole series of glaring contradictions. For instance, *I Kings* $15^{11, 14}$ says: "And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord. . . . But the high places were not taken away", whereas *II Chronicles* $14^{2, 5}$ says: "And Asa did that which was good and right in the eyes of the Lord his God. . . . Also he took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places"[1]. We find a similar contradiction in the case of Jehoshaphat in *I Kings* 22^{43} and *II Chronicles* 17^{6}. A more familiar contradiction is found between *II Samuel* 24^{1}, which states that the Lord moved David to number the people, and *I Chron.* 21^{1}, which attributes this to Satan. Again, *II Samuel* 24^{24} says that David bought the threshing-floor and oxen of Araunah for fifty shekels of silver, while *I Chronicles* 21^{25} names the price as six hundred shekels of gold.

Nor are difficulties of this kind limited to cases of disagreement between passages in the books of *Chronicles* and passages elsewhere. Sometimes disagreements are found in one and the same book, even in narratives that lie side by side, or within what appears to be a single narrative, and the frank recognition of their existence makes it quite impossible to ascribe to God the responsibility for every statement found in Scripture.

In what sense, then, can we regard the Old Testament as inspired? It is sometimes said that the older view regarded the Bible as the Word of God, whereas the modern view is that it *contains* the Word of God. I regard that as a quite inadequate statement. To me the Bible *is* the Word of God. But that does not mean that in all its parts it attains a uniform level of revelation, or that we are justified in thinking that because a passage is in the Bible it gives us an inerrant, or absolute, insight into the nature and will of God. Christ alone is the Word of God in that sense, for in Him alone is the absolute revelation of the heart of God.

The Word of God is mediated through the instrument of human personality. God, being personal, cannot adequately reveal Himself save through personality, and can only perfectly reveal Himself

[1] It may be noted that *II Chron.* 15^{17} repeats the statement of *I Kings* 15^{14}, in disagreement with *II Chron.* 14^{5}.

in perfect personality. His perfect Word is therefore in Christ, Who was perfect in Himself, and perfect in His accord with the divine will. Through others the Word was obscured to some extent by the channel through which it passed. If we pass light through a piece of glass, the result will be affected not merely by the character of the light, but also by the character of the glass. And in the same way divine revelation that comes through the organ of human personality depends for its character, not merely on the God Who is the origin of the revelation, but on the organ through which it comes to us. Were the writers of the Old Testament helpless instruments in the hand of God, completely controlled by Him, the revelation would be independent of their personality, but if they were real human persons, it could not be so independent, and if they were imperfect and fallible, then their imperfections and fallibilities could not but affect the revelation.

II.

It will be seen that I am far from proposing a view which is all too common, that the writers of the Old Testament by their own reflection and skill and penetrating insight saw what they did see of the heart of God, and recorded what they had seen. In particular, it is often supposed that the prophets were men of serious spirit and clear judgment, who meditated on the conditions of their day and saw the sickness of society, and who sized up the world situation of their times, and who then based on this what they had to say to men. While all of this is doubtless true to a point, it is wholly inadequate. The prophets would be the last to claim that it was by their own wisdom and insight that they reached their message, and would have rejected with indignation such an analysis of their work. Their word was ever "Thus saith the Lord", and they firmly believed that the word they uttered was God's word to their fellows. They were indeed men of sagacity and insight, men who meditated profoundly on affairs and conditions, but they were also men who had a great experience of God, who penetrated some of the secrets of God's heart, and who looked on the world in the light of what they had seen of God. Nor did this vision of God's heart come merely from their own effort. It was of the grace of God that they received it, and it came to them through revelation, as they freely acknowledged. It was God's act, and not merely theirs.

Why, then, was the revelation partial? Why did not God reveal Himself perfectly at the very beginning of history? It is easy to say, as we have said, that God could not speak His perfect Word to men through the personalities of imperfect men. But why could He not reveal Himself fully *to* even imperfect men? For surely here was an immediate process. If the Old Testament writers were

men who lived with God, who by the grace of God were admitted to some of the secrets of His heart, why could they not have been admitted to fuller understanding? Was it that God did not reveal Himself perfectly to them because He deliberately withheld something? Nay, indeed. The obstacles to fuller revelation were not on the side of God. He was ever willing to reveal Himself, but He could not. For the measure of His revelation was conditioned by the capacity of the receiver. In material things it is true that power to give is conditioned partly by power to receive. With the best will in the world it is impossible to put a quart of milk into a pint bottle. In the intellectual world the same thing holds. Try to explain the theory of probability or the differential calculus to a child of six. You cannot—not, perhaps, because you are unwilling, but because the child could not grasp it. And in the world of the spirit the same truth holds. But here it is not intellectual ability that is the condition of illumination, but spiritual receptiveness, and even God Himself could only communicate Himself to men in so far as their spiritual maturity enabled them to receive Him.

The same truth may be expressed in a different, yet equally familiar way. What we see depends not merely on what is before us, but on the mind which looks out through our eyes; and that is to say on the experience which lies behind us. The artist, the geologist and the botanist may look on the same landscape and see quite different things, though Nature offers equally to them all the same revelation of her treasures. And men who have lived with God have perceived different things in His heart, not because of any limitation which He has imposed upon them, but because of the limitations of their own soul.

In other words, not only did the failings of the men through whom God spoke mar the Word which He spake through them, and prevent the perfect revelation of God reaching men by their means, but those same failings marred their own vision of Him. They had false ideas of God and cherished false hopes, and these false ideas and false hopes dimmed their eyes. They could neither receive nor communicate the perfect Word of God.

III.

This can perhaps be illustrated by one or two examples from the Old Testament. In *II Samuel* 6 we have the story of David's abortive attempt to bring the Ark into Jerusalem. The Ark was placed upon a cart, drawn by oxen, which were driven by Uzzah and his brother. As the cart was going up the steep incline into the city, over the rough and uneven road, the oxen stumbled and the cart was tilted. Uzzah put out his hand to the Ark, and we are told that the anger of the Lord blazed forth against him and slew

him on the spot. That Uzzah died cannot be doubted, but that his death was due to divine anger could only be inference, and the inference may be rejected with the fullest confidence.

The account of the incident given by the Chronicler would seem to imply that it was because Uzzah was not a Levite that this *contretemps* happened. For it is there recorded that on the second occasion when an attempt, this time successful, was made to bring the Ark into Jerusalem, David was careful to employ Levites to carry it, and it is stated explicitly in *I Chronicles* 15^{13} that David recognized that the mishap was due to the non-employment of Levites on the first occasion. According to the Pentateuchal law, as it now stands before us, none but Levites should approach the Ark, and certainly Uzzah was no Levite. Was it, then, because Uzzah, despite the fact that he was not a Levite, presumed to touch the sacred Ark that he called down divine wrath upon himself?

Many considerations show quite conclusively that this was not the reason. In the first place, the Ark had been kept in the house of Uzzah's father for many years, without calling down divine wrath. In the second place, since by even the Chronicler's admission no Levites were employed on the occasion, the Ark must have been placed upon the cart by non-Levites. Yet no divine anger vented itself immediately upon them. Further, when David decided to desist from the attempt to take the Ark into Jerusalem, he placed it in the house of Obed-Edom, the Gittite, but so far from divine anger being shown for this breach of the Law, marked blessing came to Obed-Edom. Moreover, it is clear from the account in *II Samuel* 6 that David was quite at a loss to understand the mishap, and even when the Ark was moved the second time, and successfully brought into Jerusalem, the account there says nothing whatever of the Levites. It does, however, show that David was careful not to employ a cart on that occasion, but to have the Ark carried.

It is clear that if we judge the incident from the standpoint of the Pentateuchal law, as we now have it, the whole proceeding was in flagrant violation of the law at many points, and it is equally clear that David would be the person responsible for the violation. It would be quite alien to the character of God to blaze forth against Uzzah because, having been wrongly put by the king in charge of the Ark, he endeavoured to discharge his duty.

Modern Pentateuchal criticism, of course, assigns the regulations concerning the Ark, to which reference has been made, to the latest strand of the Pentateuch, dating from a time long subsequent to the age of David. This explains why David was conscious of no wrong in entrusting Uzzah with the task, and Uzzah of none in undertaking it, and accounts for David's complete ignorance of the reason for the death of Uzzah, as well as for the lack of any indication in

the narrative of *II Samuel* 6 that his being a non-Levite had anything to do with it. But at the moment I am only concerned to argue that quite apart from modern criticism the explanation of the incident offered in the Biblical sources reflects men's false ideas of God, rather than the authentic revelation of His will.

It is not, indeed, clear exactly what happened, or how Uzzah was killed, but that his death in some way immediately followed his attempt to support the Ark can scarcely be doubted. The Ark was so closely associated with God in the minds of the Israelites that Uzzah's death was immediately attributed to the activity of God, just as when, in the days of Samuel, the Ark was carried on to the battlefield of Aphek the Philistines said: "God is come into the camp" (*I Sam.* 4^{7}). It was their own preconceptions which made them interpret the fatal mishap which Uzzah suffered as the proof of God's anger. But if the character of God is unchanging, then it can never have been true that He blazed forth in anger against a man for the wholly praiseworthy act of trying to prevent the Ark which had been entrusted to him from falling. Yet not only did the people and David believe this, but it is clear that the writers of the books of *Samuel* and *Chronicles* believed it too.

To take another case, in *II Samuel* 21 we read that there was a famine in the reign of David. The king inquired through the sacred oracle as to the cause of the famine, and received the answer that it was due to Saul's slaughter of the Gibeonites some years before. We have no record of Saul's slaughter of the Gibeonites, unless, as many believe, we should identify Nob (*I Samuel* 22^{19}) with Gibeon. But apparently at some point in his reign Saul had slain Gibeonites. David therefore summoned the Gibeonites, and asked what satisfaction they desired. Thereupon they asked for seven of Saul's descendants to be given to them to be hanged. David immediately granted their request, and they were hanged, and their bodies left for the birds of prey to devour. And then we have the haunting picture of Rizpah, Saul's concubine, going out to keep watch over those bodies night and day through all the period of harvest, suffering neither birds of prey by day, nor prowling beasts by night, to touch the corpses. And we read that after that God suffered Himself to be entreated, and the famine passed.

Can this, again, ever have been true to the character of God? Can He really have desired this, or have found any satisfaction in it? Here, once more, we find flagrant violation of the law of Deuteronomy, where we read: "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers" (*Deut.* 24^{16}). But this time the violation, instead of drawing down divine wrath, appeases it. On the older view that the whole of the Pentateuch was written by Moses, therefore, we have here the divine approval of a breach of a divinely given law.

There can be nothing sacrosanct about a view which requires us so to dishonour God.

Again, however, modern criticism has established that the book of Deuteronomy was not yet written in the time of David, and its provisions were therefore unknown to David and the Gibeonites. We cannot charge them, therefore, with any breach of a law which was not yet delivered. But even so the theological problem remains, until we recognize that this incident in no way reflected the true will of God. For to suppose that God once delighted in what He afterwards prohibited would be to suppose that God had Himself developed, and however progress in revelation is explained, it cannot be by so spiritually revolting a view. It can never have been true that God suddenly, years after Saul's evil act, and even after the death of Saul, brought famine upon a nation because of that act, and was appeased by the barbarous sacrifice of innocent victims. It is easier to believe that men falsely thought that this was His character, that they were blinded by their own prejudices and foolish thoughts, and that they wrongly ascribed to Him what was alien to His heart.

IV.

But does not this mean that we are taking away from the objective character of the revelation, and substituting a purely subjective test for what is of God and what is not? By what principle shall we determine whether, when we read that God demanded a certain action from men, He did really demand it, or whether they but misunderstood His demand? By what principle shall we determine whether, when the prophet says "Thus saith the Lord", it is really the authentic Word of God, or whether it is but the partially understood and imperfectly transmitted message of God? Is it not much easier to accept the Old Testament in a plain, unvarnished way, as it stands, than to establish canons of differentiation? By no means. That way, as I have shown, is spiritually unsatisfying, since it involves dishonouring God. God is one and unchanging in character, and His character is perfectly revealed to us in Christ. If His actions or His demands were ever inconsistent with His character as revealed in Christ, then they were unworthy of Him. Any other view than this threatens the foundations of religion far more seriously than does the modern view of the Old Testament. Nor does this substitute a purely subjective standard for the objective character of revelation. It substitutes as the standard the revelation given in Christ. All that we learn of God in the Old Testament that is in harmony with the revelation given in Christ is truly of God; it came to men by divine revelation, for without revelation man cannot attain to the knowledge of God. And all that we learn of God in the Old Testament that is not in harmony with the revelation given in Christ is not of God. It represents the

misunderstanding of God by sincere men, whose view was distorted by the eyes through which they looked upon Him.

By this test we may establish that the story of Uzzah presents a false view of God. For in the days of our Lord men still cherished the view which appears in that story, and regarded a fatal accident as the proof of divine anger, and He repudiated it. Men came to Him and told Him of the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with the sacrifices. And He replied: "Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans? . . . I tell you, Nay. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower of Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay" (*Luke* $13^{2\text{ ff}}$). If such a view of God was false in the first century of our era, it was equally false in the time of David.

V.

May we not hold, then, that the Old Testament is an encumbrance to religion, and that it were better deleted from the Bible of the Church? If the revelation of the Old Testament must be tested by the revelation in Christ, would it not be better to discard the Old Testament? Assuredly not. It belonged to the Bible of the Church from the very beginning, before there was a New Testament, and without it much of the New Testament would be unintelligible. For the New Testament is the crown and culmination of a long historical process, in the light of which alone it can be understood. While it provides the standard by which the Old Testament must be tested, the Old Testament is equally necessary to its complete understanding. Beyond this the Old Testament is an unrivalled treasury of spiritual experience, speaking authentic and enduring messages from God. Its narratives need to be rightly understood, but given that understanding they may minister greatly to the strength and richness of spiritual life.

In calling the New Testament the crown of a long historical process, I have implied that there was progress in revelation. At the same time I have rejected the idea that there was progress in God, or in God's willingness to reveal Himself. What limited the revelation was not God's willingness to give, but man's capacity to receive, for He could only reveal Himself to men in so far as they were spiritually able and willing to receive His revelation. And here I would repudiate afresh the half-truth which is so common, when it is said that the Old Testament is the record of man's search for God. In revolt against the older idea that the Old Testament is a purely supernatural book, every statement of which is guaranteed by its divine author, not a few have regarded it as a purely human document, reflecting man's gropings after God, and growth in understanding of Him. But this falls seriously short of the truth. No good teacher would attribute the progress of a distin-

guished pupil solely to his own teaching skill, nor would the pupil show wisdom in attributing it solely to his own intelligence and diligence. In sound education there must be co-operation between the teacher and the pupil. So with the process of revelation. Man's search for God and God's reaching out to man are two sides of a single process, and the process is gravely misrepresented if but one side is considered. Man could never by the mere exercise of his own powers attain unto the knowledge of God, unless God were willing to give Himself unto him. But on the other hand, God could not thrust the knowledge of Himself upon men. It is of His grace that He is ever seeking to give Himself unto them, but He can do so only in so far as they can and will receive Him. And even their capacity to receive Him is itself His gift, which grows by its exercise[2].

The Old Testament is therefore neither a purely divine, nor a merely human document. There are divine and human factors woven together in it, and I would prefer to say, not that it is the record of man's progressive search for God, but that it is the record of man's growing experience of God, and progressive response to God. As such, it is a religious book of inestimable value.

VI.

It is clear that on this view the inconsistencies which are found in the Bible no longer provide any stumbling-block. I remember a Chinese Christian coming to me once in great distress. He had read in Stephen's speech in *Acts* 7 how Stephen said that Abraham "came out of the land of the Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Haran: and from thence, when his father was dead, God removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell". But he had read in *Gen.* 11^{26} that Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran, and in *Gen.* 12^{4} that Abram was seventy-five years old when he departed from Haran. But *Gen.* 11^{32} says that Terah lived to be two hundred and five years old. According to these passages, therefore, Abram departed from Haran some sixty years before his father's death, and not "when his father was dead". The good man was in great trouble about this discrepancy, simply because he had been taught an untenable view of inspiration. He had been taught to regard God as responsible for the exact form of all these texts, and the inconsistency meant to him that the Bible was not reliable, God was not reliable, and the foundations of his faith were rocking under him.

But if inspiration works, not by the suspension of human personality, but by the organ of human personality, and if human and divine factors are woven together in it, then we may be prepared

[2] *Cf. Eph.* 2^{8}, "For by grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God".

to find errors and inconsistencies, as well as imperfect views of God, without at the same time ceasing to find God's living Word in and through it. The errors and the imperfections we find in no sense challenge the foundation of our faith, for that rests, not on our view of inspiration, but on a living experience of the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

In the same way, our view of inspiration frees us to examine without prejudice and without fear the processes by which the books of the Old Testament grew, without leading us to regard them as common, or making us cease to find in them the revelation of God. We can find without being disturbed, for instance, two accounts of the setting up of the monarchy in Israel, dominated by quite different attitudes towards the institution of the monarchy, without failing to find a religious value in both.

Similarly with Old Testament prophecy. We can recognize quite frankly that many of the prophecies of the Old Testament have never been fulfilled, and can yet find the study of the prophets spiritually satisfying. For instance, we read in *Jeremiah* 51^{11}, "The Lord hath stirred up the spirit of the kings of the Medes; because his device is against Babylon, to destroy it". In the same chapter the kings of the Medes are called upon to prepare themselves against Babylon, and verse 29 declares that "the purposes of the Lord against Babylon do stand, to make the land of Babylon a desolation, without inhabitant". Similarly, *Isaiah* $13^{17\,ff}$ says, "Behold, I will stir up the Medes against them (*i.e.*, against the people of Babylon) . . . and their bows shall dash the young men in pieces; and they shall have no pity on the fruit of the womb; their eye shall not spare children. And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldaeans' pride, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah". None of this was fulfilled. Before Babylon fell, the Median kingdom fell, having been conquered by Cyrus, who added it to his kingdom. When the Babylonian empire fell, it fell to Cyrus, and not to the Medes. Moreover, it fell without bringing the horrors of war upon the city itself. There was a battle at Opis, and within a few days of Cyrus's victory there, Babylon was yielded to him without a siege or struggle. So far from the city being sacked, the transfer was entirely peaceable, and deeds of contract for the sale of property continued to be drawn up. So far from the city being made desolate, and without inhabitant, or treated like Sodom and Gomorrah, Cyrus made it his capital, in which he resided for a large part of every year.

So long as we regard prophecy as a wholly supernatural prediction of events, under the complete control of God, a single such instance is disquieting. But if we hold that there was in the prophet a gift of divine illumination, which came to him from God, but that the form of his message owed something to himself, we are

not surprised to find his presentation of a true message from God marked also with his own unjustified expectations. And that is what we find here. The fundamental heart of the message was fulfilled. The Babylonian empire was indeed doomed, as these prophets said. They wrongly identified the conquering power; they wrongly outlined the details of the fall. But the essence of their word was justified.

A greater example may be found in Jeremiah's prophecies concerning his own people. When he began his ministry, hordes of Scythian nomads were moving down through Syria, ravaging and destroying, and spreading terror before them. And Jeremiah's vision of the cauldron blown from the north seems to have had relation to that situation. And the prophet thought God was going to use the instrument of the Scythians to visit on Judah her sins, and he issued his prophecy of impending doom. But the Scythians passed down the coast road to the borders of Egypt. There the Pharaoh persuaded them by a large gift to refrain from entering Egypt, and they returned northwards, leaving Jeremiah a discredited prophet. Twenty years later, the Egyptian army met the army of Nebuchadrezzar at Carchemish, and was defeated and fled homewards, being hotly pursued by Nebuchadrezzar and his army. Again Jeremiah appears to have believed that this new peril from the north was to bring the divine judgment upon his people, but Nebuchadrezzar, like the Scythians, went by Judah to the borders of Egypt, where he received news of his father's death, and turned round and hurried back to Babylon as fast as he could. Again, therefore, Jeremiah was discredited. He seems to have been deeply concerned himself at the non-fulfilment of his prophecies. He had not wanted to prophesy disaster. Indeed he dreaded the thought of it. Yet he had felt an irresistible inner constraint to utter the word. And then it was not fulfilled. And he cried out against God, roundly declaring that He had deceived him, and made him a laughing-stock. Often he vowed within himself that he would prophesy no more, but no sooner had he done so than he felt as it were a fire burning in his bones, that could not be contained, and he had to burst forth into prophecy again. Twenty years after Nebuchadrezzar had first marched through Syria, his armies were on the march again, this time against Jerusalem. Once in the meanwhile he had moved his columns against the city, and had carried captive many of its people. But now he was coming to stamp out a fresh rising of western states, notable amongst which was Judah. Again Jeremiah prophesied doom. And this time doom fell upon the city of Jerusalem, complete and appalling.

And now it was clear that throughout Jeremiah had not been so wrong as it had appeared. God had been more long-suffering than

he had imagined, and the nation had had forty years more grace than he had at first supposed possible. He had mistaken the time and the manner of the judgment, but he had not mistaken the certainty of it. The nation that was flouting God in all its life, both public and private, that was basing all its life on principles alien to His will, must bring disaster upon itself, and even the divine love had no means of exposing its folly but by letting it drink the bitter cup of experience. So again there was a fundamentally sound message ringing through Jeremiah's words, though he had clothed the message in a form which was not wholly true.

VII.

But of what importance is it all to us? What has Israel's history, and Israel's sins, and Israel's sufferings to do with our modern world? Nothing, if that were all. But the Old Testament is not merely, or even primarily, a historical record. It is more concerned with the enduring lessons of history than with history itself. And the message of the Old Testament writers, while it was always a message addressed primarily to their own people and their own times, and related to the circumstances, the thought and the outlook of their contemporaries, was also the expression of timeless principles, which are of abiding value to men.

Take even so unpromising a story as that of Saul's war with the Amalekites, recorded in *I Samuel* 15. Here we read that Samuel went to Saul and said that because, some centuries before, the Amalekites had been unfriendly to the Israelites, it was God's will that Saul should now make an attack upon them, and exterminate the whole race. It is impossible for us to suppose that God could really commend such principles, for their application to our modern world would speedily reduce it to a shambles. We do not need to suppose that this was the authentic voice of God, but rather that it was an expression of ideas that were current in Israel in those days. Often in a campaign, either at its opening battle, or in some particularly critical engagement, Israel would vow beforehand that the entire enemy forces and all their material treasure would be destroyed as an act of sacrifice to God. The same practice was also current among Israel's neighbours, and it doubtless rested on the belief that such a vow would be likely to stimulate the nation's god to do his utmost to ensure victory. So Samuel, speaking as he believed, and as Saul believed, in the name of God, commanded Saul to go and treat the Amalekites in this fashion. But though Saul won the victory, he did not carry out the ban. He spared the king of the Amalekites, and the choicest of the spoil, and returned home. And Samuel's anger blazed against Saul, who tried to defend himself by saying he intended to offer the spared spoil in sacrifice at the sanctuary. This excuse Samuel brushed

aside with the great word "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams". Here is an authentic word of God, even from the midst of this unpromising passage, enunciating an enduring principle. Had Saul spared any of the spoil because he doubted whether God did really love this wholesale destruction, or recoiled from the indiscriminate slaughter because he could not believe it was really the will of God, we could have respected him, but he stands self-condemned because he was false to his own beliefs, because, while persuaded that God delighted in the ban, and that he was divinely commanded to put it to execution, he failed to do so at the call of nothing higher than selfishness. It is for us to translate that enduring principle into the terms of our own life, our own experience, and our own beliefs.

VIII.

There is another feature, of enduring significance, that stands out again and again in the records. It is that religious advance came time and again through the private experience of some individual, that the men who gave God's Word to Israel constantly received their message through their own personal experience. Three familiar examples of this may suffice.

Moses in Egypt saw the wrongs his people suffered with growing indignation, until one day he slew an Egyptian. Then he fled to the desert. It is inconceivable that he whose exile was born of his sympathy for his suffering brethren did not often think of them in the wilderness, and brood over their sufferings. And one day there was born in his heart the certainty that a God Whose very name was unknown to his people was setting His seal on the sympathy of his heart, and sending him into Egypt to lead the people out. This was a new and incredible thing in the world. For a God to adopt a people, weak and persecuted, and to deliver them, was a thing unknown. But Moses responded to the call, which came along lines so much in accord with the sympathy of his own heart, and the result was the Covenant of Sinai, when the people in solemn gratitude pledged themselves to the God Who had rescued them.

Hosea, faced with a tragedy that would have broken the faith of most men, found a deeper faith. His wife was faithless, and though he loathed her faithlessness and sin with all his soul, he could not cease to love her. The very depth of his love increased the agony he endured, and by the agony he endured he found a new understanding of the heart of God, and perceived that it was supremely a heart of love.

Jeremiah, the loneliest of men, persecuted by his own family, a laughing-stock to the people, a traitor in the eyes of the court, excluded from the Temple, imprisoned in a foul dungeon, found a deeper intimacy with God, and realized more fully than any other

Old Testament character the rich meaning of prayer. And he, more than any other, insisted that the true character of religion is inner, and that it consists not in outer rites and ceremonies, but in the inner purity of the spirit, while the real covenant is not that written on stone, but that written on the living tables of personality.

Here we see, so to speak, the process of inspiration. It was not a case of the writer's hand being supernaturally controlled to write words that came to him wholly from without. It was a case of men who, by the submissiveness to God with which they faced their experience, found something that far transcended in its significance the circle of their own experience. The process was not, of course, always the same. God's methods of approach are infinitely varied. But the examples at which we have looked sufficiently illustrate the principle that inspiration came, not by the suspension of personality, but through the organ of personality; that the message it brought was never unrelated to the writer's own thought and outlook, but always closely related to it; and that the form into which he cast the message owed much to him, and was not, therefore, a perfect Word of God. Yet in so far as it was the Word of God, it was of abiding significance.

The first task of all who teach the Old Testament is to help men to read it for what it is, and not for what it is not, to read its stories, not as exact records of history, inerrant in every detail, or as authoritative revelations of the future, or even as wholly trustworthy revelations of God, but rather as the experiences and thoughts of men who reached out after God, and responded to God's reaching out after them—or sometimes, indeed, closed their lives against God—and who, in the measure of their insincerity and the purity of their heart found Him, and into the inheritance of whose experience we have come. That is why we cherish their memory. We do not in superior contempt smile upon them because they did not attain all that has been granted to us. Rather do we humbly acknowledge that of ourselves, had we begun with their inheritance, we had not attained all that they did. Many have failed to learn the lessons of their experience, have failed to receive or to communicate the things that God sought to say to them, and through them to others. But the writers of the Old Testament, in the measure of their obedience to the vision of God given unto them, made possible for themselves, and for those who inherited from them, a larger vision.

THE CHURCH AND ECONOMIC SOCIETY.

By J. H. Wilson, B.A.

There can be little doubt that one of the causes—perhaps, also, one of the results—of the decline in church attendances in the inter-war-period is the fact that, compared with the late Victorian era, the churches have ceased to be a major force in politics and social affairs. The purpose of the present paper is to examine the causes of this weakening of the voice of the church, especially in so far as economic matters are concerned. The thesis is put forward, though not, of course, for the first time, that the churches, especially the Free Churches, have, through fifty years of social and economic change, continued to emphasize the approach *via* the individual. This is in spite of the fact that in both politics and economics it is no longer the individual who is of paramount importance. His place has been taken by the group—the state, the firm, the trust, the trade union, the manufacturers' association. In a firm employing a thousand workpeople the voice of the individual employee is of no account. Should it be raised in protest against some piece of sharp practice, some injustice done to a fellow employee, some exploitation of the consumer, its luckless owner is likely to find himself dismissed and his place taken by one of the apparently limitless army of unemployed. In a combine whose capital runs to tens of millions the voice of the individual shareholder is unheard. In a trade union, a producer association, the individual is practically powerless. In a competitive industry the manufacturer who wishes to improve labour conditions or improve his treatment of the consumer is frustrated by the actions of his less benevolent rivals. When we pass to an even larger economic group—the state—the ineffectiveness of the individual, or indeed of a mobilized and militant group of individuals, is seen even more clearly. Thus do we get the eternal divorce between what is preached to the individual and what is practised by the group. This might be illustrated by reference to that old-established feast of the Christian year, the Harvest Festival. To suggest that the churches should forgo this annual thanksgiving for the bounty of nature would be considered impious by practically every churchgoer in the country. Yet under present circumstances a harvest festival is nothing short of hypocrisy. Every word of a harvest hymn, every thought in the service is a mockery when the economic group to which the worshippers belong plans its agricultural policy in terms of restriction. If our worship were in line with our economic practice we should thank Providence not for an abundant harvest, but for a bad one, that the prices received by producers might be kept high. The country minister

would pray not for rain to foster the growth of the seed, but for drought to wither it, not for sun to ripen the harvest, but for rain to destroy the crop.

This conflict between what might be termed the private morality of the individual and the public morality of the group is the result of an attempt to solve group problems along individual channels. The teaching of the New Testament did not envisage, indeed could not have envisaged, an industrial society in which the separate factors were large-scale groups. The churches' attitude to-day is based largely on that teaching and it is their refusal to interpret it in the light of modern realities which causes their paralysis in the face of economic and social problems. They have been content "to renounce all claims to regulate business life in conformity with Christian principles, as distinct from inculcating the ethics of personal integrity and justice"[1]. This approach *via* the individual was adequate when the social evils against which the Church was contending were drink and gambling, both of which were dependent largely on individual habits. It is entirely out of place with such problems as war, unemployment, and malnutrition.

The case of war presents a striking illustration. So far it is true to say that the churches have stressed the *personal* questions. If the state is at war, should the individual fight? Does the scriptural division of powers between Cæsar and God demand the unquestioning obedience of the individual to the state? This is the kind of question that has been discussed almost *ad nàuseam* in the religious weeklies. Considerably less emphasis has been laid on the question whether God does not lay down certain rules that even Cæsar (particularly a democratically controlled Cæsar) must follow. Few interpretations of that text have made the reservation that the things that are Cæsar's and the things that Cæsar claims as his may not be the same. Further, with regard to the question of machinery for the prevention of war, the churches, despite fine struggles for League ideals, and, more latterly, Federal ideals, have tended to look to the more distant future when, after mass conversion of the world, war will become impossible. This tragic belief in the virtues of conversion alone leads individual Christians to trust to it *à la* Buchman while, through a neglect to provide *machinery* to prevent conflict, war has once more broken out over the heads of the proselytes, putting the work of the churches much farther back than the twenty years they had laboriously gained since 1919. The hopelessness of it all is perhaps best represented by a poster the present writer saw in a church porch in the uneasy months that preceded Munich—an invitation to subscribe to a missionary society —"Your Contribution to World Peace". To concentrate on the conversion of the East's teeming millions *as a means* to bring about

[1] J. A. Hobson, *God and Mammon*, 46.

world peace in East and West is to invite disaster, if at the same time no attempt is made to provide political peace machinery in both East and West. In the West particularly we have the tragic spectacle of large majorities for twenty years fervently desiring peace but unable to achieve it through the absence of an effective political mechanism.

This neglect of machinery in the interests of the individual is no less important in the economic sphere. In the Middle Ages there was some attempt on the part of the Church to regulate economic behaviour as any other form of conduct. The doctrine of the "just price", the ban on usury, the condemnation of the accumulation of wealth, were honest attempts to bring business under the control of the Church. They perished with the coming of the business firm and Protestant capitalism. Since that day economic behaviour, once straight dealing is assured, has been free from moral and religious censorship. The Church has never seriously answered the question whether Christian co-operation can be achieved in an economic system based on competition.

On the more sordid products of the economic system the churches have not been silent. Unemployment, low wages, malnutrition, restrictionism have presented results too glaring to be ignored. In the main, in the spirit of a long record of nineteenth century charity the churches have tried to meet these evils with personal services, in an attempt to alleviate the suffering caused. It is impossible to give sufficient praise to this work, which has done much to relieve the present pain while sociologists are slowly trying to find a serum for the disease. There has been great work done to interest members of the church in the causation of unemployment and in economic policies designed to remove it. The work of, among others, the movement led by the Rev. William Dick, and of the Christian Social Council, is only one instance of this. But it is still true to say that the Church has not, as a body, said that unemployment is not only unpleasant, but *wrong*, and that it is the duty of individual Christians, and the churches, to press for immediate policies. It is radically insufficient to preach private virtue.

This last point can be supported by two further considerations. In some cases an act which is, from the point of view of the individual, morally "neutral", that is, neither good nor bad, may have the gravest consequences on society as a whole. In some cases, an act which is, from the personal point of view, morally right, may lead to undesirable consequences socially.

These points might be illustrated by reference to particular economic events. We are all familiar with the phenomenon of trade boom and depression; the acute crisis of 1930-2 is only one in a series dating back at least to the beginning of the eighteenth century. One of the major causes of this cycle of prosperity and

depression is the fact that individuals pursue the course which for them is economically right, and which is not obviously, from the personal point of view, morally wrong. One of these courses is the simultaneous purchase of machinery in the boom and the simultaneous abstention from the purchase of machinery in the slump. The whole phenomenon is not unlike the scene described by C. E. M. Joad in his short book *Freedom To-day,* and by Sir Norman Angell in his public addresses. A cinema is on fire and the fact leaks through to the audience. It may be that the fire is not dangerous and could be got under control; but a spirit of *sauve qui peut* strikes the hearts of the audience, and everyone, thinking only of himself, dashes for the exit. In the resulting scramble many lives are lost. This is very similar to the working of an economic crisis. An insignificant event occurs in the business world—depression and panic set in, and everyone rushes to cover his losses, regardless of the effect on economic society, on employment, on other producers. The fact that apparent private interest and the public interest are in conflict provides the strongest argument for the devising of *group* machinery to control the excesses of unenlightened self-interest.

An even more striking example of the divorce between not merely private and public interest but private and public morality is found when we consider the question of thrift. Thrift, or abstinence as our fathers called it, has long been considered one of the major Christian virtues. As a well-known economist has said, commenting on the Victorian Age, "The morals, the politics, the literature, and the religion of the age joined in a grand conspiracy for the promotion of saving. God and Mammon were reconciled. Peace on earth to men of good means. A rich man could, after all, enter into the Kingdom of Heaven—if only he saved. A new harmony sounded from the celestial spheres. 'It is curious to observe how, through the wise and beneficent arrangement of Providence, men thus do the greatest service to the public, when they are thinking of nothing but their own gain'; so sang the angels"[2].

In recent years the nineteenth century belief in the social virtues of thrift has been called in question, particularly in its relation to employment. The maintenance of full employment involves a demand for the product of industry equal to the productive capacity of industry. It implies that for every penny paid out in wages, interest, rent, *etc.,* there shall be a penny spent. Otherwise, industry will lose its profitability and will restrict output and hence

[2] J. M. Keynes, *Tract on Monetary Reform,* 7-8. The quotation is from *Easy Lessons on Money Matters for the Use of Young People,* a tract published by the S.P.C.K. (12th edition), 1850. There are of course strong reasons for believing that even from the social point of view thrift was desirable in Victorian Britain. Circumstances may change more quickly than moral beliefs.

employment. An increase in thrift must mean a decrease in expenditure or consumption, and unless every act of saving is balanced by an equal act of capital investment, that is by the purchase of machinery or other capital, employment is bound to suffer. Thus thrift, which is a private virtue, becomes a public vice[3]. On this analysis is not "hoarding"—*i.e.*, saving without a counterbalancing purchase of capital—an economic sin? Is it not the duty of the economic group—the state—to counteract excesses of private thrift by equal and opposite expenditure on capital development? This might combine social utility if it is directed to slum clearance, and the building of roads and public amenities.

These two illustrations of stock market panic and private thrift afford some confirmation of the thesis that in economic affairs private virtue is not enough. There remains one further point. Attempts at private virtue may be rendered useless by the workings of the "system". We have seen the comparative uselessness of individual action in the large firm or combine. Let us now consider the case of an attempt to solve the problem of poverty along private lines—poverty, that is, other than that caused by unemployment and under-employment. Let us imagine a benevolent employer who desires to raise the wages of his work-people. This will prove impossible if his rivals do not share his benevolent aspirations. This was stressed in a number of letters referring chiefly to the light engineering industry, which I received from well-meaning employers after I had raised a similar question in a letter to the *Christian World* a year ago. One after another wrote and said that they had attempted to raise wages and improve conditions, and had been frustrated by the workings of competition and undercutting from rival employers. If any attempt is to be made to raise wages it must be along group lines.

A similar argument arises in relation to family allowances. Much of the most serious poverty of this country results from the large families of workers who are paid not according to need but in accordance with their usefulness to the employer. The principle of payments according to need has been admitted in the schedules of Unemployment Insurance benefits and Unemployment Assistance allowances. It has not yet been accepted by competitive industry; nor indeed can it be, until the problem is tackled along group lines.

The arguments of the foregoing pages may be summarized in a sentence. The insignificance of the individual in the economic process; the conflict of private and public virtue; the impossibility of solving most economic problems except on group lines—these facts have conspired to make the approach *via* the individual next

[3] On the issue of thrift, and the economic theory underlying this analysis, *cf.* J. M. Keynes, *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Chaps. 23-4, and J. Robinson, *Introduction to the Theory of Employment*, 47-50.

to valueless, in the short period, and have contributed to the churches' lack of authority on economic matters. It is essential, if they are to speak with any authority, that they make up their mind on each and every important social problem. This involves two things—research and deliberation. Research will, in particular, show the ultimate effects of private action in the economic sphere. The effects of such a thing as saving cannot be clear to the individual. If, owing to the complexity of the economic process, he abdicates his responsibility by ignoring the long-range effects of his action, the responsibility for undertaking offsetting action rests with the state—unless one is content to leave the problem unsolved. This, and the examination of different policies designed to remove the problem, falls to the task of research committees and individual researchers. Using their material, the church executives can declare their policy with regard to each problem, deny its seriousness, deny that there is a practicable remedy, or state that the cure would be worse than the disease. It may, occasionally, make a blunder. At least that is less dangerous than a policy of ignoring existing evils. By bringing group social problems under the measuring-rod of moral and religious standards, it at least impresses on the individual a sense of responsibility to act in every way open to him, including the political, to remove each abuse. And by making its voice heard, it would at least press action on governments.

The criticism might be made that—especially in a nominally democratic church—such "declarations of policy" are dangerous, and a denial of the right of the individual members to be consulted. This need not occur; facilities for debate could and should be provided. Unanimity is naturally impossible. It is far more important that the Church should have a policy based on a majority opinion than that it should remain silent merely because only in silence will it avoid saying something offensive to some individual member. Democracy never has implied unanimity; if it continues to imply inaction it is certainly doomed.

FACILIS DESCENSUS AVERNI.

By M. Chaning-Pearce, M.A.

[This article is a chapter from the author's recent book, *The Terrible Crystal* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.). It is by the courteous permission of the publishers that it appears here.—G. F. N.]

(D. H. Lawrence, *Apocalypse.*
The Letters of D. H. Lawrence, ed. Aldous Huxley.
J. C. Powys, *In Defence of Sensuality.*
J. C. Powys, *Autobiography.*)

The transition from religion to magic is facilitated by the common foundations upon which each are erected, in a mutual faith in the superhuman, however the respective concepts of this force may differ, by the fact that both call in a power other (if not "wholly other") than man at the point where he confesses himself beaten in the battle of life; and both require surrender, obedience, and, in some form, self-renunciation as the condition of participation in this superhuman power, however variously the nature of such surrender, obedience, and self-renunciation may be conceived. The nature of this transition and of the forms which it assumes to-day are evidently matters of major moment for an age seemingly set towards reversion in thought, art, and life.

The passage from religion to magic is not only an easy one; since it absolves the passenger from that effort to co-operate with the divine power which religion demands of him, it is a tempting one. "Magic readily passes into religion", says Professor Marett, "since supernaturalism provides a raw material common to them both"[1]; the converse would seem to be even more true: "because it equally belongs to the sphere of the occult and supernatural", says Professor Marett again, "and because it tends to be conceived as an affair of wills, magic, though distinct, has something in common with religion, so that interpenetration and transition are possible between them"[2].

Nor is a reversion to magic solely a religious phenomenon. It would seem, in fact, to be a characteristic movement of the present time, and the affinity which what has been called the magical conception of guidance bears to modern non-Christian speculation and life is noteworthy and demands our study.

The conception of magic postulates a "dark power" other than normal human life, with which man has, in the phrase of M. Lévy-Bruhl, a certain "*participation mystique*" and with which he can obtain effective contact by the due employment of set rites and formulæ regulated, not by reason, but by traditional experience—

[1] R. R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*, 30. [2] *Ibid.*

a dark power which is capricious and unaccountable and, if not properly placated, cruel and devastating.

Such a conception is obviously likely to gain ground whenever, for one reason or another, life appears more than usually to assume such a capricious, cruel, and unaccountable aspect, and we may therefore expect a recrudescence of magic to-day. The present age, with its grim, dark, and ghost-ridden background of the Great War, would thus seem to provide a peculiarly fertile soil for such a growth.

The most cursory scanning of modernity seems to afford significant specimens of such a trend. Perhaps the most representative figure of the post-war period was the late Mr. D. H. Lawrence. He has all the fluid hyper-sensibility to the currents of thought and feeling of his time which makes of the artist so delicate a barometer for the student of history. For him, as for many of his more sensitive and thoughtful contemporaries, the fact of the war seemed to have destroyed the last pretensions of orthodox religion, leaving him, however, with a strong flow of uncanalized religious feeling. How conscious he was of this rudimentary religious feeling his recently published letters amply attest.

"Primarily I am a passionately religious man"[3], he writes to Edward Garnett in 1914, and it is impossible not to credit the statement. "Pure religion and undefiled", as he conceived it, is plainly the dominating passion of his life to the bitter end of it. "You must learn to believe in God", he says in 1915, " . . . we shall unite in our knowledge of God—not perhaps in our expression of God—but in our *knowledge* of God"[4].

He is more conscious than many Christians of the radical nature of sin. " . . . it is surgery we want . . . there is in us . . . 'proud flesh' . . . the powerful malignant will", he writes in 1915, again under the impact of the war. From the terrible visible world he turns to the invisible. "One must put away all ordinary common-sense and work only from the invisible world. The visible world is not true", he declares later in the same year[5].

It is evident that such perceptions are fundamentally religious—the very raw stuff of which real religion is fashioned. He stands on that sub-soil of realization of the reality of evil, of the greater reality of the "invisible world", of the urgent necessity for self-mortification which has been seen to be the bed-rock of both magic and religion.

The direction in which he turns from this position is of the highest significance in our context. Already, late in 1915, we find him affirming that "we should find reality in the darkness"[6], and earlier in the same year what may be called his first flirtations with the idea of magic appear. He looks towards manticism for revela-

[3] *Letters*, 190. [4] *Ibid.*, 227. [5] *Ibid.*, 259. [6] *Ibid.*, 279.

tion, seeing in a "special race of women" a mystic channel for the passage of the "dark power" through whom the "truth came as through a fissure from the depths and the burning darkness that lies out of the depth of times". The transition to the tripod, the divine ecstasy, the gnomic oracle, seems near.

From the end of 1915 onwards the transition towards magic seems to gain momentum. In December of that year he announces that "we must grow from our deepest underground roots, out of the *unconscious*"[7]. Seven years later it seems that the full transition has been achieved. "Turn again", he says, "to the dark gods, which are the dark promptings and passion-motions inside you, and have a reverence for life"[8]. Here is the magical version of "conversion" and its logical corollary in the "fertility-cult". Two years later he calls for a "return to the older vision of life . . . a great *yielding*, rather than an act of will: a yielding to the darker, older unknown . . . the natural mystery of power"[9].

It seems clear that we are now full-launched on the "perilous seas" of magic and not far from the full-blown fertility-cult and phallic mystery-faith. Four years later we find it. In 1928 he is declaring that he writes "direct from the phallic consciousness"[10] . . . . "I feel one has still to fight for the phallic reality"[11]. Sun-worship now appears, the constant accompaniment of the fertility-cult. His "phallic" novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is "the direct *noctural* connexion of a man with the sun—the path of the dark sun"[12].

The final position at which he arrived at the time of his death in 1930 may be best illustrated from his brilliant, erratic, and highly-significant posthumous work, *Apocalypse*.

"God" is now entirely rejected; even the "little gods" are overthrown. " . . . the very ancient world", he postulates (dubiously enough in view of the trend of modern anthropological research), "was entirely religious and godless"[13]. "God and gods enter when man has 'fallen' into a sense of separateness and loneliness"[14].

The concept of creation is thrown overboard. " . . . the vast heavens" (in this new "golden age" of his nostalgia) "lived of themselves and lived breast to breast with man"[15]. In order to buttress this assumption, he affirms, quite arbitrarily and uncritically, that " . . . the cult of dying and re-born gods started all over the old world, about 600 B.C."[16]. Christ, the "Heavenly Man" conception, "that strange mysterious figure whose presence", according to Miss Jessie Weston[17], "hovers in the shadowy background of the history of the Aryan race", is thus conveniently

7 *Letters*, 290. 8 *Ibid.*, 558. 9 *Ibid.*, 605 10 *Ibid.*, 708.
11 *Ibid.*, 710. 12 *Ibid.*, 747-8. 13 *Apocalypse*, 179. 14 *Ibid.*, 180
15 *Ibid.*, 183. 16 *Ibid.*, 184. 17 *From Ritual to Romance*, 58.

ushered out of Lawrence's ideal cosmos as a theological *parvenu*, and this uncritical "wish-fulfilment" in an honest and cultured man seems symptomatic of the psychological trend.

In place of these deposed deities the "cosmos" now becomes the object of worship. "We and the cosmos", he writes[18], "are one". The cosmos is a vast living body, of which we are still the parts. This "cosmos" is and begets natural life, " . . . the divine power that came to man from the vivid cosmos, from the starry green dragon of life"[19]. It is older and greater than God or the gods, a restatement, it would seem, in the main, of Swinburne's *Hertha*:

> I am that which began;
> Out of me the years roll;
> Out of me God and man;
> Before God was, I am.

It is the living cosmos, the cosmos that was not created, that had yet no god in it because it was in itself divine and primal[20].

With this "cosmos", this apotheosis of natural life, "we are unnaturally resisting our connection"[21], " . . . we have to get back to the cosmos . . . What we lack is cosmic life"[22]. What we need is "the old Chaldean cosmic knowledge"[23]. That "cosmic knowledge" is knowledge of, correspondence with, natural life, man's "living wholeness and . . . living unison"[24]. "For man", he declares, "the supreme triumph is to be most vividly, most perfectly alive"[25]. "What we want", he says, in what was probably almost his final utterance, "is to destroy our false, inorganic connections . . . and re-establish the living organic connections with the cosmos"[26].

His conclusions "upon the whole matter" lead straight to all the phantasmagoria of the fertility-cult and pagan religion. We have sun-worship. "The sun has a great blazing consciousness, and I have a little blazing consciousness. When I can strip myself of the trash of personal feelings and ideas, and get down to my naked sun-self, then the sun and I can commune by the hour, the blazing interchange, and he gives me life, sun-life, and I send him a little new brightness from the world of bright blood . . . the sun, like a lion, loves the bright red blood of life, and can give it infinite enrichment if we know how to receive it"[27]. "We can only get the sun", he pronounces, "by a sort of worship: and the same with the moon"[28].

We have the cult of the horse, "the symbol of surging potency", "the beginning of our godhead in the flesh"[29], and are back with our dim forefathers who carved their fetish of power on the White Horse Hill.

18 *Apocalypse*, 50. 19 *Ibid.*, 198-9. 20 *Ibid.*, 186. 21 *Ibid.*, 221
22 *Ibid.*, 52. 23 *Ibid.*, 183. 24 *Ibid.*, 222. 25 *Ibid.*, 222.
26 *Ibid.*, 224. 27 *Ibid.*, 48. 28 *Ibid.*, 53. 29 *Ibid.*, 110.

Animism comes back to its own. "To the ancient consciousness, Matter, Materia, or substantial things, are God. And why not? . . . A great rock *is* god"[30]. The Magna Mater, Rhea, Cybele-Agdistis, is re-enthroned, "the great cosmic Mother robed and splendid . . . essential to the scheme of power and splendour"[31], "the woman of the cosmos wrapped in her warm gleam like the sun"[32].

It is the unashamed worship of the power of natural life, the "dark power" which all magic invokes. "Power is there", he proclaims, "accept it, recognise the natural power in the man, as men did in the past, and give it homage . . . ."[33]. This is a frank and fully conscious turning from not only Christianity, but also Platonism and Buddhism to "the old worship and study of vitality, potency, power"[34]. The test is now solely that of "vital consciousness". "Culture and civilization are tested by vital consciousness"[35].

No doubt is left as to the nature of this "vital consciousness". It is "sensual awareness", "sense-knowledge", "a great depth of knowledge arrived at direct, by instinct and intuition . . . not by reason"[36]. This form of consciousness is that to be sought; "mental consciousness" is to be deplored as the root of all our modern woes. " . . . the emotional consciousness of man has a life and movement quite different from the mental consciousness. The mind knows in part, in part and parcel, with full stop after every sentence. But the emotional soul knows in full, like a river or a flood"[37]. In fact, for such a "consciousness", the mind ceases to exist; "the mind has no existence by itself"[38]. Therefore "we must follow the logic of action rather than of reason"[39].

So headlong is this hunt of the hated mind and all its works, that one is a little reminded, in Mr. Lawrence's later works, of the famous dictum of the Queen of Hearts—"Off with their heads!". This "vital consciousness" has much use for bodies but little for heads, much for emotion but little for minds, and in this fierce and fashionable pogrom against mind and reason seems to have much in common with a very similar attitude noticeable in the "Oxford" Group Movement.

It cannot be gainsaid, and D. H. Lawrence would be the last to gainsay it, that here at least is nature-worship, life-worship, power-worship, fertility-cult, magic, in full bloom. Its anti-Christian corollary is not burked. "Jesus is a back number"[40]. "The Christian doctrine of love even at its best was an evasion"[41]. "The Christianity of Jesus applies to a part of our nature only"[42]. The

[30] *Apocalypse*, 94. [31] *Ibid.*, 153. [32] *Ibid.*, 158. [33] *Ibid.*, 26.
[34] *Ibid.*, 66. [35] *Ibid.*, 83. [36] *Ibid.*, 86. [37] *Ibid.*, 205.
[38] *Ibid.*, 223. [39] *Ibid.*, 97. [40] *Letters*, 462. [41] *Apocalypse*, 22.
[42] *Ibid.*, 24.

whole nature is essentially collectivist and therefore unChristian. "Pure Christianity . . . cannot fit a nation, or society at large . . . It can only fit individuals. The collective whole must have some other inspiration"[43]. But "men fall naturally into a collective wholeness, since they cannot have an individual wholeness. In this collective wholeness they will be fulfilled"[44]. "The State cannot be Christian"[45]. And for the nurture of this "collective wholeness" there is only this "religion of power"; the religion of love is futile.

It is a religion which, *ipso facto,* negates the religion of love. "To yield entirely to love would be to be absorbed . . . the individual cannot love . . . the Christian dare not love"[46]. Therefore out with love, in with "power". "As a citizen, as a collective being, man has his fulfilment in the gratification of the power-sense"[47].

Such is the reversion to which this representative modernity, this anti-intellectualism, this "vital", "emotional", "collective" consciousness leads. For Lawrence it is a deliberate and conscious reversion. " . . . the consciousness of man always tends to revert to the original levels", he says, "though there are two modes of reversion: by degeneration and decadence; and by a deliberate return in order to get back to the roots again, for a new start"[48].

However that may be, whatever "new start" might have ensued for Lawrence from these very "original levels", there can be no question that here is precisely that form of natural religion and magic against which the Jewish and Christian religion has fought to the death throughout history and with which it can have no parley.

That antithesis has been well-illustrated by the following typical utterances. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit", says Isaiah, in the accents of real religion. "O Ishtar what shall we give thee?", reads a Babylonian text. "Fat oxen, plump sheep, give unto me the stately appearance of the women, the beauty of the men"[49], Ishtar is made to reply. It is the reply of Lawrence at last and it is to Babylon and beyond that he has come. *Facilis Descensus Averni.*

Another typical modern, no less equipped with a strong rudimentary religious feeling, may be cited in further illustration of the same tendency, Mr. J. C. Powys, who has lately been preaching his gospel of neo-Epicureanism. " . . . this living soul in us", he says, "lives on the nourishment of little, simple sensations, and on the secret art of being passive"[50]. With him the element of magic, sorcery, and idolatry is even more fully conscious. "The

[43] *Apocalypse,* 38. [44] *Ibid.,* 212. [45] *Ibid.,* 216. [46] *Ibid.,* 218-219.
[47] *Ibid.,* 217. [48] *Ibid.,* 194. [49] Craig, *Rel. Texts,* II, 9.
[50] *In Defence of Sensuality.*

happy person", he says, in open reversion to love-magic, " . . . is the person who with the creative energy of a true magician . . . has managed by psychic sorcery, to hypnotise his mate"[51]. Idolatry follows. "It is best to worship the 'little gods' . . . what we should really aim at is to become idolaters"[52]. Here too the phallic element is overt and acknowledged. " . . . the true basic rhythm and secret reciprocity of contemplation is nothing less than a sublimation of erotic ecstasy"[53]. The fertility-cult is also manifest. " . . . this psychic-sensuous ecstasy that I am defending", he affirms, "is a direct embrace of life"[54].

He, like Lawrence, is fully conscious of the reality and radical nature of evil. "Christianity", he says, " . . . turned away from the slavery . . . not of the flesh . . . but of the remorseless, unmitigated erotic nerve"[55]. Here is the "dark power" recognized and avowed; but its force must be placated and employed, rather than resisted or sublimated, by the wise man. "Its energy can be used", he declares, "to create and sustain a world or it can be used to blight and destroy a world"[56]. What is this but the *Yezer ha-ra* of Jewish ecclesiasticism, the *massa peccati* of St. Augustine, the "grain of evil seed . . . sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning" of II Esdras, the φρόνημα σαρκός of St. Paul?

But where religion seeks to sublimate this evil lust, magic seeks to placate and employ it. "Satan and Yezer and the Angel of Death are one", says Rabbi Simon ben Lakish. Christ shall deliver him from "the body of this death", says Paul. But Lawrence and Powys seek to make terms with it, and it is noteworthy that Powys fully recognizes the capriciousness of this dark principle, "the mad freakishness of real reality"[57]. Here is the unaccountable "dark power" of magic, recognized as the principle of natural life to be placated and used by means of magic and the fertility-cult. Here, too, it would seem, is that "libido" which the Freudians find to be the life-principle and seek to placate and control with the modern magic of science.

In these two representative modern instances, spirits fine enough to record in their mercurial mental phases, though not, it would seem, great enough to master, the prevailing flux of the age, barometric prophecies of the spiritual climate which we may expect may be read. The needle is set hard towards reversion to magic, and the way on which the feet of those who mix magic with religion is set is made clear.

"One must put away all ordinary common-sense and work only from the invisible world". "Turn again to the . . . dark promptings inside you". "Return to . . . a great yielding, rather than an act of will", to the "secret art of being passive". Where such

[51] *In Defence of Sensuality.* [52] *Ibid.* [53] *Ibid.* [54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Autobiography*, 35. [56] *Ibid.*, 35. [57] *Ibid.*, 136.

doctrine led D. H. Lawrence and J. C. Powys we have seen; their gods are very other than the God of Christianity.

It may be said, and said with some cogency, that this reaction from the mental, intellectual, and spiritual approach to religious reality, this return to the "dark unconscious", the "emotional consciousness", to a more primitive, vital, and whole contact with reality is, in itself, a healthy reaction from a mode of religion grown anæmic and over intellectualized and spiritualized. Has not such a return to the primitive sources ever been the sign of a returning sanity? Is not the history of Jewish and Christian religion marked by a long succession of such reactions as these to a primitive simplicity, a revolt from sophistication, a "desert purity"? Is not the "direct guidance" and reliance upon feeling rather than reason just such a virile and sane reaction to an Apostolic Christianity, a re-dipping of religion in its original wells?

It is clear that Lawrence preached his "return" to "the dark unconscious" under such a persuasion. So evident is the need of modern life and religion for some such shedding of sophistication and return to the unmuddied springs of life and faith that the claim of such reactions as these to be, in fact, such a return, is both specious and tempting, and, in so far as they achieve such a simplification and return, modern religion and life have much to learn from them.

It cannot be denied that both have much to teach to our time. That real religion should be, and most modern religion emphatically is not, in Professor Brunner's phrase, a "totality-act of personality", the fruit of the reaction to reality of all our faculties and not of some only, to the atrophy of the remainder, is a proposition which few modern thinking and feeling Christians would oppose, or that some such broadening and simplification of the psychological and vital bases of religion as both Lawrence and Powys advocate in their respective fashions is indeed an urgent need to-day. Each after their kind is evidently impelled by a healthy, heroic, and admirable desire "of fire to reach to fire"[58], which religion can but welcome and emulate if it can.

But this is not the real issue. Is the return variously attempted in the "secret art of being passive" of Powys, in the "yielding" to "dark promptings" of Lawrence, a return to the gods of magic or the God of Christianity? For the history of religion is at least as prolific in instances of the former as of the latter, and the process, in its initial stages, is not easy to discriminate. Judaism is found constantly reverting to a magical baalism, primitive Christianity to the ubiquitous mystery-cult.

[58] G. Meredith, *Hymn to Colour*.

It is in the final issue of these respective modes that the fundamental and insuperable antinomy becomes clear. Magic leads to the "dark power" of natural life, to the natural "cosmos" itself, by way of the "noctural", "emotional", "collective" consciousness of D. H. Lawrence, the "erotic ecstasy", the "remorseless unmitigated erotic nerve" of J. C. Powys, the Jewish *Yezer ha-ra,* the Pauline φρόνημα σαρκός, to the life-gods, sun-gods, and moon-gods and fertility-baals. Christianity leads, by way of a dogged wrestling with this very *Yezer ha-ra,* and armed with the love which is, not ἔρως but ἀγάπη, to the "Yahvé" of the prophets, the "Father" of Jesus, Who may never be identified with this life-god and to Whom magic and fertility-cult is for ever an abomination, Whose service is real religion and, not servitude to any "Ba'al", but "perfect freedom".

For the one "guidance" seems to be sought through magic, of which the characteristics are some form of life-immolation, fixed, irrational, and traditional formulæ and rites, blank receptivity and initiate-exclusiveness on the part of the guided, distrust of mind, servile obsequiousness to absolute oracles; while, for the other, "guidance" is rather an intelligent co-operation with a God Who is the Father of men and the Divine "Friend behind phenomena".

"By their fruits ye shall know them". The fruit of modern anti-rational, quasi-magical reactions such as those exemplified by Lawrence and Powys is the "Dead Sea" fruit of to-day.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

A PROTESTANT IN ITALY.

By the Rev. J. Stanley Perkins, M.A.

Not long ago I stayed in La Spezia, one of the naval ports of Italy, fifty miles south of Genoa. On Sunday morning I went to the little Protestant Evangelical Chapel[1] in that town. In the entrance porch was a table, with small cheap copies of the Gospels for sale. This, of itself, was a novelty in Italy, where the people are encouraged to attend mass but not to read the New Testament for themselves in their own language. Inside the chapel there was a central pulpit and on the Communion Table in front there lay an *open* Bible. This Bible always remains open as a symbol of the need of the people not only to possess a Bible but to read it. On each side of the pulpit was a notice board, one showing the numbers of the hymns, and the other stating the chapter of the lesson. On that Sunday it read, in Italian, S. Giovanni, $15^{1\text{-}17}$, and many of the people followed the reading in their Bibles. The lower borders of the walls of the chapel were covered with pure marble, because in Italy marble is as common as stone in England, and even the front door-steps of quite humble homes are made of marble, and the quarries of Carrara were not far away.

The little chapel was well attended with a good proportion of men, many of whom, during the sermon by the Italian pastor, leaned forward eagerly to catch every word of truth. For an evangelical sermon, without ceremonies, is a novelty in Italy. If we British folk were exiled to Italy for the rest of our days, we should value our Protestant sermons more than we do. We are perhaps too evangel-hardened, and it might do us good to be deprived for a time of the chance of hearing a gospel sermon or of going to a Protestant church.

1 General Director: the Rev. H. H. Pullen, Casa Alberto, La Spezia, Italy.

In the congregation was a large number of schoolgirls in uniform, and these belonged to a Protestant orphanage connected with the Mission. But there were only *six* boys present—and thereby hangs a tale. In La Spezia there is, in addition to the girls' orphanage, a splendid large building recently erected as a Protestant Orphanage for boys. From many parts of Italy there have come over a hundred applications received for orphan boys to attend that school, but just when the building was finished, "Sanctions" were imposed by Britain on Italy, and at twenty-four hours' notice the Protestant day schools were ordered to be closed, and the Government issued orders that the Boys' Orphanage was not to be opened. And to-day that fine building lies empty except for a caretaker. The Headmaster, who is still waiting to be allowed to open the school, cannot get any other work, because he is a Protestant and is not a Fascist. (Despite the Dictatorship there are in Italy to-day one million non-Fascists.) And even if he wanted to join the Fascists, he could not do so now, for he would be under suspicion. The order not to open the orphanage came from the Italian Government, but the Protestants are convinced that it was the Roman Church that pressed the government to act, for one of the chief characteristics of Rome is intolerance to every other faith. Suppose that every Roman Catholic day school in England was ordered by our Government to close at twenty-four hours' notice, what an outcry from Rome there would be! Yet that is exactly the conduct of Rome towards Protestants in Italy. In England we see the Roman faith at its best, for of necessity it must be of a high standard in a Protestant country, or it could not prosper. But once let Rome become predominant in this country, and we shall have the same story of religious intolerance repeated here. I never feel so strong a Protestant as when I travel in Roman Catholic Italy. We all recognize that the Roman Church has a certain appeal in its historic character, its world organization, its rich ceremonial and cathedrals, its calendar of saints, and the logical precision of its doctrine, but all this must be put in the scale against the loss of religious liberty, which to us is essential to our very manhood.

Outside the little Protestant chapel is a notice board on which is to be seen the words: "Sunday, 10.30. Cult of Adoration". This means "Public Worship". I liked that word "Adoration", for we are sometimes told that in our English Protestant worship the note of adoration is insufficiently emphasized. The notice then read: "Sunday, 8 p.m. Cult of Preaching". And further down: "Friday, 8 p.m. Cult of Edification". That means Bible Study. Here again I was delighted, for if in all our Protestant churches in England a weekly meeting were held, not chiefly for prayer, or an address, or a discussion, but to study the Bible, our churches

would revive. The Sunday Schools are doubtless supposed to teach the Bible, but too often we find instead the cult of little nature stories which are not specifically Christian at all, and could equally well have been taught in ancient Greece to the worshippers of Zeus and Aphrodite. Or a story is told with a little moral tacked on, but with no real Christian significance. In some classes Bibles are hardly used at all, and if they are required they have to be sent for, and hunted up, and sometimes the answer comes back: "We can't find any more". Many English Protestant churches are sadly neglecting what to Italian Evangelicals is so important—this Cult of Edification, this systematic Bible Study.

But the work of these few faithful Protestants in Italy is not confined to the towns, but ventures forth into the villages. At one place a group of lads gathered round the evangelist, who spoke to them of the Duce, and their eager readiness to obey him, follow him and fight for him. He then told them of another Duce, and another fight, and, listening eagerly, in the end they took his books. Such is the work which even the passing traveller in Italy may see for himself. All honour to the brave little band of Protestant Italians.

BIBLE HUNGER ABROAD.

By Blanche M. Moore.

One of the most cheering signs of the times to-day is the continued demand for the Bible. Amid the welter of wars, the menace of dictatorships, and the lowering of moral standards generally, the sales show an increase daily, especially abroad. Strangely enough, it is in most demand where the struggle is greatest and where the difficulties appear to be overwhelming. That this is so in Spain is evident from the sales records of the Barcelona branch of the Geneva Bible School. The returns show an increase of over 6,000 for 1937; at the annual Book Fair last June, the figures were 729 complete Bibles, 223 New Testaments, and 2,174 Gospels, *i.e.*, over 3,000 copies sold under the bombs of Barcelona. In spite of nightly air raids, the stall in the Rambla was crowded at an early hour on the first day, and the stock of Family Bibles, which are popular in Spain, were sold out.

Said one buyer, "The Bible is a good book for these days", and another, "The Bible is a book which should not be hidden, we should show it to everyone". The chief Spanish paper published a picture of a soldier coming to buy the Gospel, and the Barcelona Wireless Station published a report on the first day's sales.

All the reports of the Geneva Bible School centres emphasize in varying degrees the hunger abroad for some definite assurance of the reality of God. Over 350,000 Bibles, whole or in parts, were

sent out to 46 countries in 136 languages through workers in 16 countries. These stalwarts in Bible campaigning display great courage in their methods of approach. They have one slogan, "direct action"; and they do what others do not do, and go where others do not go. Wherever a crowd is to foregather they find a way into the midst of them. With the seriousness of desperate conviction, and waving the Bible aloft to command attention, they cry out, "This is the Bible, it is for you all, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, it is the only book which means life and peace and it contains a message for you". This they do daily and ceaselessly and while following their own occupation whenever possible. Surrounded though they are by criticism and hostility, the chance remark of a passer-by indicates that their efforts do not pass unnoticed: "Here is someone at work, with us it is meeting after meeting and no one at work".

The founder of the Geneva Bible School, Mr. Alexander, in one of his monthly letters to his workers and sympathizers, writes on the modern need for direct attack.

> Many are finding that methods so much blessed in past days are not cutting any ice to-day and that some are completely outworn. Without any spirit of impatience or seeking for something new, they feel that the Church has lost touch with the world around, and that God would have them "cast their nets on the other side of the ship". The remedy may be simpler and nearer than many think, but in the meanwhile, believing prayer and waiting on God about this in the same mind and spirit will always have its reward. A new generation is growing up without God and without hope.

All workers in this movement receive careful training and instruction in methods of approach for groups and individuals. They are inspired with one aim and one goal, to sell and distribute the Bible to the "uttermost parts of the earth".

Since its beginnings some thirty years ago in Geneva, the founder has lived to see that goal within sight of accomplishment. Arising out of Bible study courses begun along the lakeside towns in 1907, a monthly paper was published, and shortly afterwards the growth of the work necessitated the opening of premises in Geneva. Ten years later the British and Foreign Bible Society sent the first boxes of Bibles in different languages, and in 1919 the Bible School was established for distribution purposes.

A glance at *Work at Work* best illustrates the methods employed and the thoroughness of the training. Individual effort is concentrated upon every section of the community. Taking France as one example, the types approached include the strollers on the Boulevards, students of Montparnasse, artisans, peasants and priests, sightseers on the Promenade des Anglais at Nice, the

prisoners in French Guiana, and the Foreign Legion in North Africa.

Outside a *café* in Paris during Whitsun week a group of people were gathered round a little boy who had just taken his first Communion. The boy was interested in the Bible and one of the gentlemen in the group bought one, saying, "I am a Catholic, but I want to read the Bible". A little girl in her white robe and veil came up to us with 20 francs in her hand. She knew what she wanted and carried off her Bible before the eyes of the astonished crowd.

The group work includes the chief European Fairs, Exhibitions, and Conferences; at the fairs and big markets in the principal towns a stall is set up of the Bible House in miniature, with large maps of the world showing in raised type the languages in which the Bible is printed, and copies of all its issues.

The outstanding success of the stall at the French Colonial Exhibition of 1931 gave a great impetus to the work as a whole, with a record sale of 11,000 Bibles with New Testaments and portions in 100 languages. A postal department was opened to deal with the vast correspondence which followed and which resulted in a steady increase of customers at the general *dépôt*. Many Roman Catholic priests became Bible students for the first time. One request came from Bulgaria asking for a Bible to be sent to all the lawyers and leading men in Bulgaria. Others came from Central Asia, Afghan, and Tibet, the meeting place of Buddhism and Islam. An advertisement in the Esperantist Journal on the occasion of the great Congress at Lausanne in May, 1938, brought 29 requests for 15 different countries: Holland, Hungary, Italy, Denmark, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Canada, U.S.A., Scotland, Belgium, France, and Germany.

In the spring of the same year the International Telephone Conference held at Cairo proved fruitful ground in which to sow the "Seed of the Word". Over 500 diplomatists, government administrators, engineers, lawyers, and business men from all parts of the world attended. A fortunate circumstance provided the official list of the delegates in the early days of the conference. In order to concentrate upon those who have never had the Bible in their possession, the British Empire and North America were excluded from the workers' programme. Out of 400 offers 3 Bibles, 120 New Testaments and 8 Gospels in 22 languages were sent out. Almost all the countries sent in one request at least, Japan and Portugal the largest number, and in striking contrast to the rest of Europe there was no response from the 24 German delegates. Legation officials in Egypt and personal friends of the delegates accounted for some 23 New Testaments, and the first Moslem to ask for a Bible was one of the general secretaries of the Conference. He was eager to have one so that he could study it.

I saw something of this work at the Paris Exhibition, where I came across the Paris Bible Stall quite unexpectedly in the Amusement Park. Here as elsewhere, the position chosen revealed a sure knowledge of the psychology of crowds. An Amusement Park and a Bible Stall! How eminently wise this choice proved to be, where the stream of young people continually converged! A conversation with the young salesman brought out some illuminating facts concerning the methods used, the nature of the enquiries, and the personality of the enquirers. The stall was not set up until July owing to the difficulty in getting permission for a site, but in the three weeks since its opening 450 copies had been sold, and at the end of the Exhibition the figures were: 4,166 Bibles, 1,216 New Testaments, 793 Gospels, and 138 portions, 6,313 in all.

By far the greater number of enquiries came from young people under thirty years of age, and on the day of this conversation 30 out of 31 who had visited the stall had never seen a Bible before. A Dutchman stayed for an hour interested in the questions and discussions of the buyers. It was a cheery half-hour I spent listening to the account of the day's happenings, becoming increasingly conscious that the strength of this work lies in the singleness of its aim, serving as it does no particular church, creed, or sect. Story after story told of the deep hunger everywhere for a sure anchorage in a world of physical, mental, and spiritual conflict.

The December issue of the *Work at Work* deals with the reactions shown during the period of tension through which Europe was passing in the autumn. Paris, the "city of light", was all dimmed and preparing to live in darkness, for war seemed at the gates. Yet 8 Bibles were sold among the crowds clamouring for the latest editions of the newspapers, and 105 New Testaments were ordered for the Maginot Line. At Nice a loudspeaker invited everyone, in view of the Munich conversations, to reflect for one moment at 3 p.m. A car stopped at the stall at that moment and a request came for 3 Bibles. In Barcelona a republican soldier who had found a Gospel of St. Matthew on the Ebro front came for another so that he and his friends could continue to read it together. Another said, "Formerly I was a revolutionary, but since I commenced to read the New Testament all that has disappeared from me, and now the love of God fills my heart". At Bordeaux, when the colporteur knocked at the doors, many dared not respond, they were too obsessed with the fear of evil tidings. People no longer believed in peace and hope. "I no longer believe in anything, my husband was killed in war, and now my sons must go to war". But "after Munich" the report of one worker stated that it was painful to pass those two days amongst a multitude indifferent and closed.

But the work goes on, and in the words of their leader there is a message for all:

> It is ours to be instant in season and out of season as never before, and to live realizing fully the significance of the great events through which we are passing, for things will not remain as they are. "Be filled with all the fulness of God", in order to bring Him to men, and men to Him.

P.S.—Since this article was written there is news of the work in Germany, where up to the early autumn nine students of the Bible School were still working.

A former student living in Berlin wrote of a young men's weekly prayer meeting in Berlin where hundreds of copies of the Bible have been distributed, chiefly among soldiers and workmen.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

MATTHEW ARNOLD.

The long evenings this winter have given me the chance of reading Matthew Arnold again; it is surprising how little there is, except perhaps his theological ventures, which one cannot read and enjoy. Arnold died in 1888, and the fifty years since have been kinder to him than to some of his contemporaries; his influence survives and he is being read increasingly. A generation which has forgotten how great those Victorians were is reading him for the first time, and is finding that there is no room for the odd notion that he is out of date.

Matthew Arnold does not rank as a poet with the greatest poets of the nineteenth century; but he has, and will always have, a very high place among the voices which have spoken in the simplest words of the mystery of life. He felt that mystery, and he knew how baffling it is. But he never lost his head, and never surrendered the hope of one day clearing a way through. It is this balance of mind, this steady insight, which make him so valuable. And he has besides a gift which he recognizes in Wordsworth, the power of seeing into the soul of Nature, and of giving us in this striving age something to rest on; or if in Arnold's case it is not quite that, it is something that has in it a secret of restfulness. If there is to the end a note of unsatisfied longing in his poetry, and a sense of frustration, so that he seems sometimes like his own

> . . . pale master on his spar-strewn deck
> . . . . . .
> Still bent to make some port he knows not where,

and warns us to fly from the intellectual fever of the age; still, he never gives in, never yields to the prevalent pessimism, but goes on his way

> Still nursing the unconquerable hope,
> Still clutching the inviolable shade,
> With a free, onward impulse brushing through,
> By night, the silver'd branches of the glade.

And this note is better attuned to our modern need than the faultless music of Tennyson, or Browning's optimism with its too little of light and shade.

To those who do not know Arnold's poetry, or who may have neglected him for a long time, and it is for these alone that I venture to write, nothing shows Arnold's greatness and his appeal to our day better than his "Scholar Gipsy"; and "Thyrsis", the tribute to his friend Arthur Hugh Clough. Then there are such shorter poems as "Dover Beach", "A Summer Night", and "The Future"; and if you would see Arnold's regret for a past that is fled, and yet his refusal to be dragooned into a colourless unbelief, there is the "Grande Chartreuse", which contains the revealing lines about himself—

> For rigorous teachers seized my youth,
> And purged its faith, and trimm'd its fire,
> Show'd me the high, white star of Truth,
> There bade me gaze, and there aspire.

I cannot refrain from quoting the lines from "The Future" in which he sees man, as he comes down the river of Time, reaching at last the infinite Ocean, and perhaps rest:

As the pale waste widens around him,
As the banks fade dimmer away,
As the stars come out, and the night-wind
Brings up the stream
Murmurs and scents of the infinite sea.

I remember that my first interest in Arnold was not his poetry but his humorous idea of Nonconformists as a people living in strong Philistine cities, and in need of a better education; in fact the very opposite in their qualities of that combination of "sweetness and light" which was his own specific for the improvement of England. Doubtless he was driven in upon himself by all he suffered as a school Inspector, and his judgment of Nonconformity was deflected by his experience of the very limited range of it represented by British school managers. But he saw in Nonconformists the head and front of that offence of middle-class self-content against which he waged incessant warfare. This was the warfare against the Philistines which he says had worn him down. He pretended that in the battle the Philistines were too many for him; and that (from his ineffectual place) he could only offer a protest against their tumultuous self-confidence. This was the weapon Arnold used as a very skilled fencer. He had no philosophy, no special knowledge which entitled him to speak; he was an inquirer, a student; he wanted to know the best that had been thought and said in the world; and if he could, then to throw light where there was darkness, and especially the grace and truth which belong to a true culture. It was all very exasperating to the great middle class which had done everything, and never dreamt that their education could be improved. Arnold's polished self-distrust could turn at times into a dreadful invective, and the young lions of the *Daily Telegraph* had plenty to roar about. There is nothing Arnold enjoys better than this bout of irony and sarcasm and persiflage, and the pretence all the while that he is not equal to it. And there come moments when he pulls out all the stops, and his emotion carries him away; as in the famous eulogy of Oxford, "home of lost causes, and forsaken beliefs, and unpopular names, and impossible loyalties"; or again in the beautiful tribute to Newman in the lecture on "Emerson"—"Somewhere or other I have spoken of those 'last enchantments of the Middle Age' which Oxford sheds around us, and here they were!" I do not know anywhere a more consuming scorn for whatever is cheap and loud than the last sentence of the Preface to *Essays in Criticism,* where he faces the enemies of culture:

> Apparitions of a day, what is our puny warfare against the Philistines, compared with the warfare which this queen of romance has waged against them for centuries, and will wage after we are gone?

What then does Arnold really mean? Was he carrying on an academic debate, and firing into the air? The best reply to this is to read his *Culture and Anarchy,* a book which has a singular appropriateness to our circumstances to-day. Over against the prevailing idea that the highest good in life is "the right to do what one likes, and to say what one likes", to have great possessions in modern barns, and, in Hebraic phrase, "to live long in the land"; against this Arnold sets up the thought of culture as the "pursuit of perfection", and that our aim should be, in the words of Bishop Wilson, "to make reason and the will of God prevail". For him the Socratic maxim, "Know thyself", holds good. And his charge against the men of his own day is that they do not pursue perfection; they are content with low standards of judgment, and when they have light they never care to see that the light that is in them is not darkness. In his literary criticism there is the same underlying thought; we are satisfied with less than the best, and

we so accustom ourselves to praise what is mediocre that we lose all sense of the sunlit heights. And so we find him saying in his noble appreciation of Milton:

> If to our English race an inadequate sense for perfection of work is a real danger, if the discipline of respect for a high and flawless excellence is peculiarly needed by us, Milton is of all our gifted men the best lesson, the most salutary influence.

Arnold's prose is what he himself would have called a prose of the centre. It wears, and you can read it for the enjoyment to be had from it. Whatever you may think of his literary verdicts and his general view of things, there they are in all their clearness and often disarming cleverness for you to take them or leave them. It is only in his later work when he falls into one or two tricks of style, and overdoes a phrase or a turn of thought, that he loses hold. Let any one read "The Study of Poetry", or the essay on Wordsworth, and then ask himself where they can be improved as easy and lucid writing, and he will appreciate why it is possible, though not without risk, to differ from Arnold's literary judgments, but hardly possible to improve on his way of saying things; except in one thing, and that is an imperfect ear for the rhythm of language, and with it a certain deficiency in that emotional quality which Arnold singles out as characteristic of the Celtic literature. Thus there are few passages in Arnold's prose which can be quoted alone, as you can quote, *e.g.*, Bunyan's account of the shepherds on the Delectable Mountains, or many of the passages in Newman where he sets all the bells ringing, and mystery spreads in from the everlasting hills. I have quoted from the address on Milton, and it is an example of a strong and restrained prose, Arnold perhaps at his best; but when Newman comes to speak of the "Powers of Nature" and the works of the Lord, he seems to lose himself: "Every breath of air and ray of light and heat", he says, "every beautiful prospect, is, as it were, the skirts of their garments, the waving of the robes of those, whose faces see God in heaven". Arnold could not have written that: it is the difference between spiritual genius and the highest effort of the lonely intellect.

But in one thing, their knowledge of the Bible, these two men, so different in emotional texture, stood together. Arnold knew his Bible; not theories and dogmas for which he cared little, but the Scriptures in the Authorized Version. He strove for the recognition of the literary value of the Bible, and although his *Literature and Dogma* was amateurish, it was a better book than his critics made out. In his love for the Bible Arnold was one of the Puritans, and no understanding of Arnold is possible without allowing for the large dose of Puritanism in him. It was hereditary and derived from his father, who might well have been described as a Philistine of genius. And Matthew Arnold knew very well that there was a strain of Philistinism in himself.

I have no space left for more than a brief quotation from "Rugby Chapel". It shall be the passage in which he speaks of his father's fearlessness and faith:

> If, in the paths of the world,
> Stones might have wounded thy feet,
> Toil or dejection have tried
> Thy spirit, of that we saw
> Nothing—to us thou wast still
> Cheerful, and helpful, and firm!
> Therefore to thee it was given
> Many to save with thyself;

And, at the end of the day,
O faithful shepherd! to come,
Bringing thy sheep in thy hand.

It is a noble tribute, and betokens a transparency of mind and heart in himself which Englishmen in their love of home will not forget. Matthew Arnold had his faults; but to read "Rugby Chapel" is to forgive all.

A. T. S. James.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

If the State were confessedly Christian, and if the Church were apparently united, it might not be wholly unreasonable to base a working unity of both on an agreed allocation of functions. But when neither of these conditions can be shown to exist, when the State is frankly non-Christian, and the Church is notoriously divided into sections, it is obvious that such a scheme of harmonious co-operation is altogether impracticable. Hooker in fact was the apologist of an Establishment which rested on assumptions, political, ecclesiastical, historical, and scriptural, which have lost validity. It was less the *arguments* of the Nonconformists than their *existence* that finally destroyed Hooker's case for a national church. The Church of England still retains the imposing façade of the Elizabethan Establishment which Hooker defended, but that façade is as delusive as it is picturesque. It belongs to a Past which can never return; it has little hold on the Present, and less hope for the Future. Its passing away, which cannot be long postponed, may conceivably release spiritual energies which it can now only hamper and conceal.

HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON, *The Church of England.*

So far from faith and Sacraments being mutually exclusive, they are mutually indispensable. Faith is the motive power which enables the soul to journey on to Christ; the Sacraments are the path along which it travels. Faith is the locomotive which draws the train; the Sacraments are the rails on which it goes.

G. D. ROSENTHAL, *Quest and Achievement.*

The Minister of Railways, Mr. Chang Kia-ngau, is fitting up a special railway coach called "New Life on Wheels" that will travel over as many lines as possible, spending some time in centres large and small. It will be equipped with movies, and other forms of visual education, that can be used on the streets and in halls and chapels. See that your church co-operates with this unit when it comes to your locality. You can secure its schedule by writing to the New Life Movement Headquarters, Nanking. (1937.)

One of our Cabinet Ministers, who is a non-Christian, remarked one day that he was studying the Bible. When asked if he were a Christian, he replied, "No, but I notice that the Christians throughout the country show a greater self-sacrificing spirit than others, and, therefore, I feel that there must be something in Christianity." (1938.)

MADAME CHIANG KAI SHEK, *China in Peace and War.*

As long as the sending countries were prosperous and funds came in, all was well. Christians of the countries which had been evangelized by the missionaries regarded Great Britain and America as lands of fabulous wealth, and to build a Church all that was necessary was to call for increasing grants. Thus the system of payments for work grew up which tended to kill the spirit of voluntary evangelism. Said an Indian Christian to me once: "Why is it you do not evangelize this area as you used to do?" My reply was that it was the duty of the Church to evangelize, the missionary was only an auxiliary helper in the primary task of the Church, and that as the Church in India had come into being, the duty of evangelism was passed from the missionary to the Church. He listened to me with interest and then

agreed, but with this qualification: "Yes, sir, it is our duty and we will do it *if you pay us*" . . . History reveals the rather startling fact that the only religion that has spread on other than a self-supporting basis is Christianity, and we are bound to ask ourselves how far the administration of foreign funds has been wise. An Indian Christian has said: "If the missionaries had come as Jesus sent out His messengers, without purse and scrip, we Indians would gladly have supported them and their Church, but they came with lots of money and elaborate equipment. Instead of giving support we learnt to expect support".

W. Wilson Cash, *The Missionary Church.*

Again, if one group of Christians is more notable than another for the abundance of their fruit, it is the Society of Friends. And they neither baptize nor administer the Holy Communion. I have a strong feeling that Church people commonly do not face the implications of this fact. That is just where we need more of the exactness and humility of the scientist. However much some might like to believe that the sacraments of the Church are the main channels of the Holy Spirit's influence, and that outside those channels the tide is altogether shallower, the facts do not allow such a conclusion. The influence of the Spirit is not canalized in that way.

J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro, in a University Sermon at Oxford, printed in *The Modern Churchman,* February, 1940.

WHAT IS THE FAITH?

A Parliament once chose Fourteen Ministers to draw up the Fundamentals of Religion, as a Test of such as were to be tollerated in Union: There were Dr. Owen, Mr. Nye, Dr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Sydrak Simpson, Dr. Cheynel, and others: Bishop Usher was chosen, and refused; and I was chosen in his stead: Before I came they had drawn up Fourteen or Fifteen Articles all in new Terms of their own, and some neither Essential, nor true: I told them that we were not to make a new Christianity or Creed, but must own that which the Christian Church was known by in all Ages: But I could not be heard, though Mr. Vines and Mr. Manton joined with me. . . . the Parliament were glad to pass by all their Works, and take no notice of it, lest it should be a publick Reproach that we could not agree on the Fundamentals. And I am glad that I hindered such an Agreement as they would have made, instead of the old Creeds which they would not rest in. . . . If they say that they own the same Creed that we do, why then do they not use it as the Test of Christian Profession, but instead of it leave every Pastor to make one in Terms that is only his, and no two Churches have the same: . . . The Assembly could never get them to tell whom they would take to be of their Communion, and whom not.—*Reliquiae Baxterianae,* ed. 1696, Appendix, p. 75.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS,

HERMANN RAUSCHNING.

Germany's Revolution of Destruction. Eng. tr. E. W. Dickes. Heinemann, 1939. 10s. 6d.

Hitler Speaks. Thornton Butterworth, 1939. 10s. 6d.

Herr Hitler, Ihre Zeit ist um. 1939. pp. 39. Price in England, 2s.

Apart from scanty official documents there have been two sources of information about Germany since the Revolution; one has tended to be little more than the panegyric of partisans, and the other has been criticism by exiles and enemies. These three books represent a third source, probably more reliable than either, the memoirs of a disillusioned adherent. Rauschning is just over fifty, an East Prussian landowner who fought in the war and became disgusted with German party politics and joined Hitler's movement in 1931. Two years later he became President of the Danzig Senate and one of Hitler's inner circle. Dismayed by the Party's management of affairs, local no less than national, he protested, co-operated as long as possible, then left the country. He is therefore a unique witness of the new Germany. He has written a general analysis of the spirit of the Revolution, which two such different judges as Karl Barth and Harold Nicolson consider to be perhaps the most important single book on the subject. He followed this up with a record of his conversations, and a short but crushing indictment of Hitler himself in the form of an open letter: "Herr Hitler, your time is up".

Rauschning's sincerity is attested personally, and is clear to the careful reader of what he writes. The conversations are from a diary, not all sensational; they form a valuable corroboration of recent evidence. English readers will naturally ask why, if these things are true, Rauschning ever joined the Nazi movement, or did not clear out of it much earlier. The answer lies partly in the desperate nature of the German political situation over the last ten years and can be put in Rauschning's own words:

> We have followed you a long way, Herr Hitler. You seemed to us, in spite of all obvious shortcomings, to be the man who snatched us from long years of irresolution. Much about you was foreign to us and terrified us. But we thought we saw weighty reasons why you should bring about a reign of terror in Germany. We knew that political leaders must go through dark and marshy places and cannot remain guiltless. We followed you, Herr Hitler.

These words are confirmed in the two longer books. Rauschning is obviously no subtle politician, though there can have been few more difficult positions in Europe than that of intermediary between Hitler's Reich and the League of Nations in the City of Danzig. He seems, without offence, to be a Prussian "Junker", believing strongly in the great conservative forces of Germany—the Church, the Army, and the Monarchy—convinced also that Germany's destiny is bound up with Western civilization.

His testimony is therefore more than weighty; it is overwhelming. This man heard the Reichstag fire and the plans for the purge of June 30th discussed, not as an enemy or a suspect, but in the inner councils of the Party with whom he then identified himself. He is the mouthpiece for thousands of his countrymen who followed Hitler because there seemed to

be no other way of national recovery, and who, less well informed, are not yet disillusioned or who go on within the Party because they see no alternative but chaos. This first account from within is the more terrible because it rings true. It must in my judgment be taken very seriously by all who claim to be informed or to guide others in the present European upheaval.

Germany's Revolution of Destruction develops the startling thesis of the "revolution without a doctrine".

> "What matters politically to-day is not the rise of national socialism as a philosophy. Racialism is its make-believe; the reality is the revolutionary extremism revealed not in its philosophy but in its methods". (p. 16.)
>
> "A machinery of absolute and universal dominion is being created in an entirely disorganized state". (p. 28.)
>
> "There is indeed only one national socialist long-range aim—to be ready to put in an appearance and claim equality of rights and force compliance with its claims in every problem in world politics". (p. 277.)

This analysis of the German Revolution as a power-movement, led by men without principles, ready to do anything to maintain and to increase their power, may appear simple, but it is borne out by what we now know of the chief actors; it explains the barbarism which has accompanied an apparently almost bloodless revolution; it is in entire accord with German policy since Rauschning's first book appeared, and it is the upshot of most conversations with Hitler in the second book. *Hitler Speaks* is a record of conversations that took place before 1935. (For those unable to buy the English translation there is a better one in French, illustrated, at less than half the price of the English book.) These conversations show that German domination was years ago planned by the Führer on a far greater scale than he has so far realized it. His new policy of preparing the ground from within another country gave him the assurance of defeating not only France and England, but of revolution in Mexico and even in the U.S.A. Hitler had in 1934 a detailed plan for the capture of Sweden. As to similar projects, here is a typical passage:

> We need space, he almost shrieked, to make us independent of every possible grouping and alliance. In the east, we must have the mastery as far as the Caucasus and Iran. In the west, we need the French coast. We need Flanders and Holland. Above all, we need Sweden. We must become a colonial power. We must have a sea power equal to that of Britain. The material basis for independence grows with the increasing demands of technique and armaments. We cannot, like Bismarck, limit ourselves to national aims. We must rule Europe or fall apart as a nation, fall back into the chaos of small states. Now do you understand why I cannot be limited, either in the east or the west?
>
> I asked him whether he was not trying to fly in the face of nature . . . What about Britain, Hitler shouted at me. Didn't Britain get her Empire by theft and robbery? . . .

We should be wrong to dismiss such revelations as petulant outbursts. They are petulant only in tone; in essence they are parts of a coherent policy to which all energies of the German Reich are ruthlessly sacrificed. The destructive will is apparent in odd sentences: "The Czechs must get out of Central Europe . . . We shall easily germanise the population of the Baltic states . . . we shall never give up Alsace and Lorraine" (pp. 46-47). When

Rauschning puts the direct question: Do you seriously intend to fight the West?, Hitler stopped walking up and down the room: "What are we arming for, then?".

From these day-to-day jottings, the main qualities of the Führer's character come out very clearly: cruelty, jealousy, spite, lack of any generosity or idealism, complete opportunism, an extraordinary political sense, of men as well as of parties, immense assurance (nothing would convince him that France was not ripe for revolution and to be discounted as a serious enemy), scorn of details and technicalities of economics and the like ("avoid obvious inflation and get the unemployed off the streets" are his urgent instructions), entire unconcern with means used to gain his ends, a strange gift of simplifying complex problems down to one or two crucial points, and dealing with those so pitilessly that ordinary opponents using traditional methods stand no chance. Often childish and silly, never humorous, calculatedly furious, laughed at by his colleagues, able to bewitch even a Schacht in a personal interview, this man is ready to bring the whole force of a great state into play to gain each point in his programme.

The last pamphlet comes as near as we can get to the answer of countless decent Germans who were forced to follow this man and are sick of his yoke. The indictment needs little comment:

> You have led us to the abyss, Herr Hitler . . . Were it not for you, the German people could have peace, at once, and co-operation with other nations. It is your war, not the war of the German people. You have made Germany a nation of cynics . . . You have ruined our country's youth . . . your work for Germany will be crowned by a civil war the like of which has never been known . . .

Christianity is concerned in all three books, but significantly not as a departmental activity but as a sign of how deep and terrible is the ruin of Germany. Everyone should read at least the chapter on Antichrist in *Hitler Speaks:*

> Fascism if it likes may come to terms with the Church. So shall I. That will not prevent me from tearing up Christianity root and branch, and annihilating it in Germany . . . We must prevent the churches from doing anything but what they are doing now, that is, losing ground every day.

Put this alongside the comment in Rauschning's first book: "the destruction of the spirit of Christianity in Germany is certainly more far-reaching than appears on the surface". (p. 96.) Its last stronghold appears to be the army. "As things now are in the Reich, the only possible rebirth of the State must come from the army, from the purified spirit of a genuinely Christian and western soldiery". (p. 168.)

There is some little hope of better things in the shock of these years on the mass of the people. Rauschning claims that there has risen up within Germany a kind of revulsion, an "ethical Fronde" and that men have seen, at least since the Prague coup of last March, the devilish nature of their leaders. Since the Russian alliance, such men must be more numerous. There are probably many who would share this moving confession:

> If anything has been gained at all in these years of oppression it is the recognition they have forced on us of the elementary fact that there is such a thing as impartial justice, and that the doctrine of violence and the exclusive pursuit of power lead inevitably to revolution and destruction. (p. 315.)

A witness so frank about his own country should be listened to on ours. He has not much to say, but this may cause us to pause in denouncing Germany: "There were plain reasons for the ultimate predominance of destructive over creative tendencies in the foreign policy of German nationalism, one being the complete political sterility of the so-called victor powers".

And the disease analysed in these three books is not purely German. It has made Rauschning terribly clear-sighted:

> This new world war threatens to become an open world revolution, a sanguinary and universal revolution of unending civil wars. National passions may seem to take the place of those of the "class war". but these last will return in full force as an element of destruction. Behind the coming great wars there rises already the figure of world-wide revolution as the one shaper of the destiny of mankind.

W. G. Moore.

Jethro Bithell. Modern German Literature, 1880-1938. Methuen. 18s.

There is much in this packed survey that is for specialists only, but it offers valuable and unusual information about a great people with whom we can no longer have direct communication. Here is gathered together for our inspection what the Germans in the last sixty years have been thinking, writing, trying to express, about themselves and our modern world, the mirror of their dreams as of their fortunes. (The house of Methuen is establishing something of a reputation for informative books of this kind.)

Any who try to read the book through will probably be snowed under by the avalanche of names and titles and summaries, but they will find it an excellent book of reference when they want to know something of important writers like Carossa or Hans Grimm or Kaffka or the Mann brothers, or Binding or Kolbenheyer. Of all these there is an interesting and readable account, and the big central chapter on Rilke is important for all readers of this journal. It portrays not inadequately one of the great spiritual conflicts of our time, a conflict which has produced a beauty in German words that is proving increasingly attractive to English students.

And for those who have time and courage to go further, the book may reveal more than interesting men and writings. Recent German literature is a poignant reflection of the distress, the utter unhappiness of modern civilized man. Books that seem to deal so morbidly and constantly with sex and soil and blood are a sign of the desperate attempts men make to get behind the superficial, the commercial, and the false, to anything that promises real enjoyment or fulfilment of personality. It is a literature that cannot be called religious, although almost all its important writers deal with religious problems. The fact that so many and such gifted men refuse or distort Christianity is the measure of what lies beneath the German tragedy of this century.

W. G. Moore.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

The Church of England. By HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON. Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d.

The Gospel and the Church. By CHARLES E. RAVEN. Hodder. 8s. 6d.

It is often claimed that the Anglican is the most comprehensive of Churches, and that in it more freedom is to be found than in any other. The writers of these volumes are among its most distinguished members, though we have heard fellow-Anglicans, in language almost sulphurous, doubt their right to be members of the Church at all. The Bishop's book is the first volume in an "English Institutions" series edited by Lord Stamp, who can scarcely have read the proofs, for his own Preface speaks of a "dignatory" and on p. 249, by an unfortunate misprint, "Baptists" become "Paptists". There was no mistake, however, in the selection of Bishop Hensley Henson for this volume; he has always known what he wanted to say and has not lacked the courage to say it, while his virile style always makes it a pleasure to read what he writes, whether we agree with him or not. Take, *e.g.*, these words on the Virgin Birth:

> The believer may, of course, hold that a Virgin Birth is the necessary concomitant of a Divine Incarnation, but if he does this, he must not affirm that it is a historical fact, since in default of the requisite evidence it can be no more than a theological inference, or a pious opinion.

Alike in his Historical Introduction and in his survey of the position of the Church of England to-day the Bishop is thought provoking and mind disturbing. The position he has reached in regard to Establishment is well-known, and is illustrated in the quotation in "Worth Noting".

The other side of the boasted comprehension of the Church of England is revealed in the chapter "Of Subscription", where we are told that at the present time it

> exhibits a doctrinal incoherence which has no parallel in any other church claiming to be traditionally orthodox.

On "The Bishop", "The Clergy", "The Parochial System", and "National Education" we have chapters packed with irritants to discussion. Sometimes the Bishop's judgments appear too decisive, as in regard to the exchange of livings, where he allows nothing for the new lease of life an incumbent gets in a new sphere. We cannot follow him through his clearcut survey, but merely draw attention to the passage which discusses the decay of Protestantism, attributed to its exaltation of the preacher's function; now when society is not settled, but fluid, when Press, Platform, and Broadcasting have taken over most of that function; and when Sunday is secularized and the churches empty, the function has, indeed, disappeared. But all these things do not affect the confessional.

That so human a scholar as Canon Raven can be Master of Christ's and

Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge is illustrative of the Church of England at its best. Canon Raven has already given many proofs of his ability to discuss deep theological problems in a way that appeals to the ordinary man. This new book is called "A Study of Distortion and its Remedy". The Gospel—*must* we call it the *Kerygma*?—is

> the proclamation of an act of God in Jesus, an act manifested in His life and work and culminating in and summarized by His death and resurrection.

The sacramental value of nature is a necessary corollary to the Gospel, and belief in a historical event is the Gospel's source. Its distortion came when "Christianity was given a subtle twist towards denying the worth of nature and history".

The Church in its true nature was a *koinonia* based on *agape; koinonia* rather than test-creeds or hierarchies or cultus was its differentiating characteristic. In examining "The Church Organic and Organized" Canon Raven's arguments are very compelling, though sometimes he is too unqualified in praise or criticism; perhaps neither *Revelation* nor Tertullian deserve the scathing censure they receive. But if readers will measure all that is behind straightforward sentences like these, they will be carried far:

> If Christianity in the eyes of the law was a burial-club, in the eyes of the average man it was a mystery-religion.

There are some fascinating pages in the chapter "The Recovery of Nature", but it is safe to assume that "The Necessity of History" will rouse traditionalists and Barthians, for it is quite merciless in its analysis of their crudities. Thus Canon Cunningham's dictum, "It is easy to follow Dr. Barth if you are living in the security of a Senior Combination Room", is driven right home. Certainly our Congregational conservatives are not to be found in the slums or in churches which pay the minimum stipend!

Canon Raven goes on to urge that as the Church recovers its understanding of the Gospel it will emancipate itself from the degradations of nature and history. Only so can it meet the challenge of totalitarianism. The final chapter, with its approximation to Prof. Macmurray's *Clue to History*, its brief but able examination of "the problem of the Quakers", is an admirable survey of "The Church and the Community". Altogether a book to be read and re-read.

EDITOR.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS.

The Psalms translated with Text-critical and Exegetical Notes. By W. O. E. OESTERLEY. 2 vols. S.P.C.K. 32s.

In the last fifteen years there have been as many commentaries on the *Psalms*, written by competent scholars. The fact that there have been so many—more than on any other book of the Old Testament—is at once a tribute to the place won by the *Psalms* in the life of the Christian Church and an acknowledgment of the difficulty of the commentator's task, in which there can be no finality of achievement. All that he can hope to do is to serve his day and generation by doing for it something not already done by his predecessors. That might seem a difficult thing to do, in view of their number. But, in fact, scholarship is always opening new ways of approach, whilst tastes and needs vary from decade to decade, and there is always room for honest work in making available the work of scholars writing in languages other than English.

The need for a good English commentary on the *Psalms* has long been felt, and Dr. Oesterley has gone far to supply it. Some of his readers, like the present reviewer, will regret that he has so often yielded to the Hebraist's temptation to emend the text where it seems corrupt, or at any rate not first-class Hebrew. The plain man wants to know what is the best meaning to be extracted from the *existent* text, rather than how it might conceivably be improved. Critical commentaries are only too often like Ezekiel's valley of dry bones, because they are filled with the skeletons of defunct emendations, no longer any one's concern. Gunkel, in fact, so glories in his new inventions that he prints an appalling list of them at the end of his commentary—and Dr. Oesterley here follows Gunkel somewhat too often.

The plan of the volumes is to preface the commentary by fourteen short chapters, dealing with the chief topics arising for the study of the *Psalms*, such as poetical form, theological ideas and the later history of the *Psalms*. (Several of these are contributed by Professor T. H. Robinson, who also writes the commentary on twenty-two of the psalms.) Dr. Oesterley recognizes the dominant influence of prophecy on the Psalmists, whilst often arguing for the working-over of pre-prophetic material. He does not think that the *Psalms* are always "monotheistic", but his proof-passages seem rather to ignore the evidence of the contexts. The mere retention of ancient phrases proves little; it is their setting which decides their meaning. He also alleges references to life beyond death in certain psalms, where a different judgment is taken by many scholars. Both in the introductory chapters and in the commentary a great deal of useful information is given, which is not easily obtainable by the student unacquainted with German, to say nothing of that wide knowledge of Judaism and Rabbinic learning, which has enabled Dr. Oesterley to render such great services in the past to the English student.

Perhaps the commentary will be felt to be rather too prosaic in its interpretations of this great collection of Hebrew poetry. But students of the *Psalms* will be sufficiently grateful for what Dr. Oesterley has actually given them, which will ensure to this laborious piece of work a secure place for some time to come.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

A Preface to Metaphysics. By Jacques Maritain. Sheed & Ward. 6s.

Anyone who wishes to understand Thomism as a working philosophy for the present day cannot do better than make a careful study of this brilliant piece of work by M. Maritain. It is not easy reading, but it is stimulating in a high degree. How, indeed, could it be easy, if it was to possess any value, when it deals with that apparently most abstract of all philosophical themes, pure Being? Hegel meditated on pure Being until it disappeared from view and left Nothing behind; but from that strange transformation he went on by means of his method of Thesis, Antithesis, and Synthesis, to deduce the whole system of Thought, of Nature, and of Spirit. M. Maritain does not attempt quite so much; but his meditation, which he invites the reader to follow, produces all the same a marvellous transformation of the concept of pure Being. To be successful in understanding Being, he tells us, we must have the metaphysician's insight: only some men have this. Aristotle and St. Thomas had it in a high degree: even so great a man as Kant had it not at all; and this is the real explanation of the defects of his philosophy. When, with the metaphysician's intuition, we regard Being steadily and see it whole, it reveals itself to us, not as a bare identity, but as a rich complex. It may be simple in itself, but our thought has to present

it from different aspects and by means of contrasted concepts. Thus it contains the opposition of Essence and Existence, and manifests itself in the different forms of the One, the True, and the Good. It is worth while to read M. Maritain's little treatise only to see how he derives all these differences from the one concept of Being. He goes on to explain how the nature of Being also includes the principles of Identity, Sufficient Reason and Causation; and he concludes by saying that the story is still unfinished. In fact, we are told by the publishers that the present work is a preparatory essay towards a larger book on Thomist Metaphysics which they hope will be produced some day.

One very interesting feature of M. Maritain's Thomism is the way in which it is continually related by him to various modern movements in philosophy such as the intuitionism of Bergson and the existentialism of Heidegger. This makes the book all the more valuable.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Nature of Thought. By BRAND BLANSHARD, B.Sc., Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 2 vols. 32s.

The Library of Philosophy, of which this is a new volume, grows and grows. It has found a place for many notable books, of which Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* is the most outstanding, apart from translations from foreign languages. Dr. Blanshard's work may be described as an attempt to bring Bradley up to date by means of a confrontation of the Idealist philosophy with its various modern rivals, the object being to justify Idealism by the proof of its superiority to all other philosophies. By Idealism is here meant, as the reference to Bradley implies, not the Subjective Idealism of Berkeley or the Critical Idealism of Kant, but the Objective Idealism of which Hegel is the greatest exponent, and which in Britain is associated with such names as Green Caird and Bosanquet, as well as Bradley, and in America especially with the name of Royce, for whom Dr. Blanshard has a warm admiration.

The thesis of *The Nature of Thought* is that Coherence is the one test of truth. Thought has two aims, the one transcendent, the other immanent. Its transcendent aim is to know reality, its immanent aim is to produce a system coherent in all its parts, which satisfies the mind just because of its coherence. But, it may be said, may not such a system be merely a pleasing figment of the mind, a dream in which we indulge by the exclusion of all discordant facts? Empiricism sneers at Idealism for its "tender-mindedness", and proclaims its own "tough-mindedness"; while common sense declares that correspondence and not coherence must be the test of truth—we think truly when our thought *corresponds* to reality. Thus Idealism is attacked from different sides. Nevertheless Dr. Blanshard maintains that it possesses the truth. What can thinking be but the effort to make a system; and when we are systematizing, do we not *ipso facto* believe that we are on the way to the understanding of reality? The faith of the Idealist is that the immanent aim of thought agrees with its transcendent aim; progress in systematization brings us ever nearer to an understanding of reality. Perfect knowledge would be a system of internal relations in which every proposition implied all the rest, and nothing required determination from without: such a system would correspond to reality, having in fact taken reality into itself. Meanwhile, there are degrees of truth: there are systems of greater or less completeness. But all thought, so far as it is systematic, has truth in it.

The speciality of Dr. Blanshard's book is his comparison of this doctrine with the opposing views of the pragmatists, the logical positivists, and so

on. Here he is altogether up-to-date, offering a survey of the philosophy of the twentieth century in England and America. His general drift is to show that, while the coherence theory of truth cannot be absolutely proved, the only alternative to it is complete scepticism, which in the end is the death even of the empirical science which the empiricist so prizes. There is nothing in empiricism to forbid the view that in the greater part of the universe two and two are seven, and that true propositions are also false.

Dr. Blanshard has pursued his theme with great thoroughness: he writes with lucidity and he has produced a consistent and excellent defence of Idealism. A notable feature of value in his book is the way in which it does justice both to the psychological and the logical aspects of thought. He complains rightly that the psychologists often study the process of thought simply from the standpoint of natural science, without ever considering how the process can result in knowledge; while the philosophic epistemologists regard with an Olympian scorn every attempt to show *how* thought works. The result is an almost impassable chasm between the two points of view: this chasm Dr. Blanshard has set himself to bridge. He has endeavoured to study the facts about ideas and reflective processes without forgetting that the most significant thing about them is that they are means to the end of knowledge.

The Nature of Thought is an immense work of wellnigh twelve hundred pages. But the subject of Epistemology, of which it treats, is at once the most difficult and the most vital in any system of philosophy. Dr. Blanshard does not waste words: every part of his book is a real and genuine contribution to his subject.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Work of Jesus in Christian Thought. By ALEXANDER MCCREA, M.A. Epworth Press. 6s.

An Introduction discusses very well the various tendencies of the present time which militate against interest in the doctrine of the Atonement. Without a belief in a personal God and an adequate recognition of sin, no doctrine of the Atonement can come into being. Mr. McCrea says that he assumes the existence of a personal God and of the moral order; on this basis he spends some time in emphasizing the true and only sufficient interpretation of sin as opposition to the Divine Will.

There follows an account of the treatment of the Atonement in the New Testament. This is well done: it occupies a large part of the book. But the history of the doctrine in the Church, which follows, is not so satisfactory. The author indeed anticipates criticism by saying that he does not aim at completeness. But it is the proportion that is wrong. Like Dr. Rashdall in his Bampton Lectures, Mr. McCrea devotes an altogether disproportionate space to the patristic theology: on the other hand the whole doctrine of orthodox Protestantism is most strangely omitted. Perhaps Mr. McCrea thought that this was the one part of the subject that his readers would know about without his having to inform them further. It is only fair to say, however, that Mr. McCrea does give good accounts of the doctrines of those theologians whom he selects for inclusion; and he brings the history up-to-date by adding an illuminating chapter on the most recent developments.

The book concludes with a short positive statement intended to meet present-day difficulties. The author reviews in turn the Ransom theory, the Satisfaction theory, and the Moral Influence theory. He recognizes partial truth in them all; but when he comes to work out the nature of this truth, it is significant that he begins from the Moral Influence theory and looks at such conceptions as ransom, propitiation and satisfaction in the light of it.

What is meant may be illustrated by the treatment of the idea of satisfaction: Christ satisfied the Father, not by any penal substitution, but by a true devotion to His honour and glory, by which He both condemned sin and established a guarantee that righteousness would be attained by all His followers.

Altogether, Mr. McCrea's book ought to serve a useful purpose in introducing its subject to those desiring a first acquaintance with it. The author is interested in what he writes and writes interestingly: he also has a definite concern to emphasize the fundamental importance of a true doctrine of the Atonement, and will help his readers towards such a doctrine.

It is a pity that one or two errors have crept into the final positive statement, just where the book reaches its climax. On p. 265 Mr. McCrea speaks of Anselm as fearing lest the foundations of the eternal throne should be shaken by "amateur theologians like Peter Lombard". Peter Lombard was no amateur theologian: his famous "Book of Sentences" was the manual of theological instruction in the Universities of Europe for three centuries: on it innumerable commentaries were written, some of them by the very greatest of the schoolmen. Moreover, Peter Lombard was born somewhere about the time when Anselm died, and his theological work was done half a century or so after Anselm's.

Then on p. 280 Mr. McCrea refers to Grotius, and says that he introduced "the novel idea" that the punishment of sin could be borne by proxy. But the notion of penal substitution is the common doctrine of all the Reformers and of all the orthodox Protestant theology so curiously omitted by Mr. McCrea from his historical survey. It was certainly no novel idea in the time of Grotius, who wrote "to defend the Catholic faith against Faustus Socinus": what was novel in the doctrine of Grotius was his abandonment of all attempts to prove any *quantitative* equivalence between what men should have suffered as punishment and what Christ actually bore.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Three Ways of Thought in Ancient China. By ARTHUR WALEY. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This is a most interesting book, but because of its nature it is difficult to summarize. It consists chiefly of extracts from the writings of Chuang Tzu, Mencius and Han Fei Tzu. Many of these extracts contain teaching in the form of aphorisms or anecdotes, which are often extremely telling as they stand, but are not capable of being reproduced adequately in the form of abstract statement. For anyone, however, who has the time and is not deterred by having to take up one thing after another in a desultory way, there is a rich harvest of thought awaiting his attention. The author's interpolated introductory passages and comments are extremely well done, and furnish the necessary information for an intelligent perusal of the extracts.

Chuang Tzu was a leading Taoist philosopher. The Taoists maintained the doctrine of "inactivity" in opposition to the Confucian insistence upon discipline. They believed, like Wordsworth, in a wise passiveness; as is illustrated by the following words put by Chuang Tzu into the mouth of Lao Tzu, the great sage of Taoism (he is supposed to be addressing Confucius, who was his contemporary):

> Learn to guide your steps by Inward Power, to follow the course that the way of Nature sets; and soon you will reach a goal where you will no longer need to go round laboriously advertising goodness and duty.

This is a typical specimen of the doctrine of Chuang Tzu. Mencius on the other hand as a Confucian praises goodness and duty. But his view

was that the way to promote these was to prevent men losing the right feelings which all have by nature, but which are apt to disappear in the rough and tumble of daily life. Mencius emphasized the value of sympathy and of the feeling of responsibility for the sufferings of others. His ideal was that of a government, not by force, but by goodness. If the king were actuated by goodness, all would be well. He says to King Hsuan:

> If you this day were to set up a form of government founded on goodness . . . all would be so bent on coming to you that no power could stop them.

The philosophy of Han Fei Tzu was of a very different order. He was a Realist and believed that all right action must be produced by external pressure. Right was what the rulers wanted, wrong what they did not want.

Surely there is nothing new under the sun: our present-day alternatives seem to have been conceived long ago. It is indeed interesting to be able to read in the works of the ancient sages of China principles that are so like those advocated and enforced in our own time.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Divided Christendom. By M. J. CONGAR, O.P. Centenary Press. 12s. 6d.

A book on Reunion by a French Dominican is bound to be interesting, even though it may provoke the question *Cui bono?* The basic assumptions of his Church make it impossible for any Roman really to approach the question with an open mind, and Father Congar quite naïvely reveals this. For example, in a note on p. 39 he writes: "It is quite clear that from the Catholic point of view, if we can consider Protestant or other dissidents 'individually', there is no special problem; they are in error and must be converted". And, again, in his summing up of the position, he writes: "for us, indeed, the Catholic Church is 'the' Church—simply and without qualification—and consequently Reunion must be the 'return' to this one existing Church". In spite of these presuppositions, however, Father Congar's treatment of the whole subject of Reunion is very fair, and is amply documented from sources outside the Roman communion. He discusses the historical divisions of the Church, the Oecumenical Movement, with which he says Rome can have nothing to do, the Anglican conception of Unity, and the idea of a Bridge Church, and has a very illuminating chapter on the Orthodox Church and its relations with the Roman. He defends the refusal of his Church to take part in such conferences as Life and Work and Faith and Order, because the whole purpose of these conferences rests on the assumption that the Church of Christ is not an already existing reality, but "that all Christian bodies which preserve a minimum of ecclesiastical order and doctrinal tradition are in some measure, though imperfectly, the Church of Christ". Though he cannot accept such a position, Fr. Congar is often really better than his creed. He says, for example, "directly a soul is in any degree united to Christ, it belongs by that fact to the Church", and he frequently refers to the wider association of all those who are devoted to the cause and following of Christ as implying a kind of churchmanship. Though the book as a whole gives no hope of any modification of Roman intransigence, it is well worth studying, not only for its comprehensive view of the whole situation as between the divided Churches, but because it makes quite clear the position of the Romans and undermines that easy optimism with which some good-natured people always seem to approach the subject of Reunion.

W. B. SELBIE.

Psychological Issues. By R. S. Woodworth. Columbia and Oxford Presses. 22s.

Professor Woodworth has been for more than 30 years head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University. He recently passed his seventieth birthday, and his colleagues have signalized the occasion by publishing in this volume a number of his writings hitherto scattered in various periodicals. Many of them are of interest only to specialists in the subject, but others have a more general character and a more popular appeal. Among these latter is a very shrewd and devastating criticism of Freudianism for its poor psychology, its tendency to regard striking and extreme cases as typical, and its obsession with sex and sexual motivation. There is also an interesting discussion of racial differences in mental traits, of the relations between psychiatry and psychology, and a very timely article on the teaching of psychology as that is carried out in American universities. The book is prefaced by an autobiographical sketch which reveals the development of Dr. Woodworth's psychological interest and affords a key to the understanding of much in his later writings. He claims that he is not a behaviourist and that he still believes in introspection and in something like intuition, but the general impression which his work produces is that with him psychology is practically confined to physics. There is no question as to the importance of the contribution which he has made to both practical and theoretical psychology, but it is equally clear that psychology as a science is still in its infancy and that it is a question whether the great claims made on behalf of physiological psychology can ever be substantiated.

W. B. Selbie.

Learning to Think. By Lindsay Dewar. Rich & Cowan. 3s. 6d.

This little volume by the Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt, in the "Needs of To-day" Series, discusses in popular and readily intelligible fashion the logical and psychological principles involved in accurate thinking and the art of persuasion. It can be heartily commended to non-technical readers, especially those who are ambitious to engage in public speech and discussion.

Love in Action. By E. S. Woods. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

Those who listened to the Bishop of Lichfield's wireless talks on the Incarnation and Christian Discipleship will be glad to have them in this permanent form. They are simple in language but rich in suggestion. Both ministers and lay folk should find them exceedingly helpful.

The Love of God. By Dom Aelred Graham. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

This book is described as "an attempt to treat of man's love for God, in its larger and more general aspects, in a way that is acceptable to a critical and thinking mind". It is based upon Thomist principles and covers a wide field of Catholic teaching and practice. Such problems as Education, Revelation, Faith, Grace, Ritual, Prayer, Evil, Mysticism, Christology, and the Sacraments are handled with much sweet reasonableness, combined of course with entire loyalty to the standards and methods of discussion characteristic of the Roman Church. In the treatment of the doctrines of grace, of the Virtues and the operations of the human mind, Protestants will find much that is reminiscent of the old-fashioned faculty psychology, but the book will repay their reading and will help to correct some misunderstandings as to the implications of certain aspects of Catholic theology.

E. J. Price.

The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus. By H. G. Hatch. S.P.C.K. 6s.

This investigation of the Christological data in the Synoptic Gospels is based upon a tentative acceptance of B. H. Streeter's Four Document Hypothesis together with his reconstruction of Q and Proto-Luke. Dr. Hatch examines the sources separately and in detail, and shows that with differing emphases they all alike presuppose on the part of Jesus a consciousness of His Messianic vocation as involving an unique relation to God. The maintenance of the secret of His Messiahship is due to the fact that Jesus knew Himself as Messiah with a difference—not the conventional political Messiah, but the Heavenly Son of Man and the Servant of the Lord, in such wise that the destiny of men was being determined by their attitude to His mission. In the light of this Messianic consciousness, Dr. Hatch discusses the Kingdom of God, the Parousia, Ethics and Eschatology, and the Apocalyptic Hope. The book is worthy of careful study as a full compendium of the evidence.

The Lesser Parables of Jesus. By G. R. H. Shafto. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

Mr. Shafto here follows up his earlier book on the "Stories of the Kingdom" by a series of studies of the similes and metaphors of Jesus, the word pictures and thumb nail sketches which are not usually included among the parables. The studies are brief but often illuminating and suggestive. Preachers may find some useful hints here.

Jesus the Son of God. By Frederic Greeves. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

The writer sets out to exhibit the centrality and significance of the doctrine of the Incarnation in the history of the Church and in the light of our present perplexities. He has non-technical readers specially in mind, and ministers and others will find here much useful material for a series of week-evening addresses or group-discussions.

E. J. Price.

Social Religion. By Douglas Clyde Macintosh. Scribners. 10s. 6d.

The writer is Professor of Theology in Yale University—a Canadian by birth, but an American by adoption. The book deals, in a measure, with the American situation, but it is comprehensive enough to make a powerful appeal to all lovers of Social Christianity. Dr. Macintosh envisaged a much larger scheme in writing his book, hoping to deal, first, with personal religion, then social religion, and lastly, theology. Had he started with personal religion, we might have had in that case a fuller and more satisfying portraiture of Jesus. But, under the limitations he set himself, we have a very fine exposition of the great truth which Jesus proclaimed and embodied, "the Kingdom of God is at hand". The first part of the book centres round "The Concept of the Kingdom of God", "The Social Content of the Gospel", and "Man's Part in the Coming of the Kingdom".

All this is very valuable. Dr. Macintosh accepts the possibility that Jesus conceived the coming of the Kingdom in the thought-terms of His own time, and He may have looked for a miraculous divine intervention, but that does not alter the substance of the Christian message or the urgency of its appeal.

The chapter on "The Keys of the Kingdom" will furnish a fine theme for a wise preacher. One cannot but feel that the writer all through is true to the historic background. His interpretation of the Beatitudes, his plea for social justice and well-being as central to the religion of Jesus, strikes a realistic note:

> The Christian as follower of Christ is committed to the Will of God as his way of life and the Will of God is the highest well-being of humanity.

This conception of Christianity is at last finding its way into our current thinking, and we are indebted to men like Dr. Macintosh for driving this truth home to the heart and conscience of the people. I have no space to follow the writer into the latter half of the book, where he deals with "The Problems for Social Religion" such as "The Prevention of War", "The Abolition of Poverty", and "The Safeguarding of Liberty". These chapters quiver with realistic pictures of the world-situation and point the way to the only solution that will end the present tragedy.

A few quotations may help to give briefly the writer's point of view:

> The form of the message may bear the marks of a pre-scientific world-view but its central principles are valid and applicable to all time.
>
> The Lord's Prayer furnishes us with the key to his fundamental thought about the Kingdom of God.
>
> God's initiative on the one hand—man's freedom and responsibility on the other, must both be recognized.
>
> I do not think that American Christians were the originators of the Social Gospel, though, if they were, they would have been one of America's greatest gifts to the world.
>
> It is devoutly to be hoped that the present tendency in certain European Christian Circles to obscure the social significance of the Gospel of Jesus may not permanently prevail.
>
> The Communism of the early Church was the direct outcome of Jesus' teaching and example. It was the communism of unselfish love.
>
> The Sermon on the Mount gives expression to the absolute, universal, and eternal ideal for the conduct of persons in society and we ought to approximate to this ideal as closely as we can.
>
> Human persons are the channels of Divine grace.

I commend the book with confidence.

FRANCIS WRIGLEY.

The Framework of Faith. By LESLIE SIMMONDS. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

In the Introduction to this book, which also serves as an Introduction to a series on "The Teaching of the Church", Canon Roger Lloyd, the Editor, declares:

> This series of books is planned to be of help to the Parish Priest, and his workers, as they reply to the challenges of this generation with the challenge of Christ. Every book in the series is intended no less for the enrolling member of the Mothers' Union, the Scoutmaster of the Church Troop, the Day and Sunday School Teacher, than for the Parish Priest.

Such a statement gives to the reviewer his norm of judgment, and he naturally asks how far the book achieves such an aim. To Mr. Simmonds was given the difficult task of expounding Christian doctrine to such varied bodies of leaders; it is too much to expect that he would be completely successful. The arrangement of the book covers broadly speaking what used to be called "The Plan of Salvation"—the Existence, Nature, and Revelation of God; the Nature of Man; the Incarnation, Atonement, and Resurrection; the Church; and Man's Final Destiny.

On the whole the book is a lucid interpretation of these great themes. The least satisfactorily handled subjects are those which deal with the

Resurrection and Ascension and, from the New Testament's point of view, with the Origin and Constitution of the Primitive Church. Mr. Simmonds insists on the Resurrection of the Body and enters upon a polemic against those who believe in what he calls "a mere spiritual resurrection". One has the impression that the author has made an intellectual concession to orthodoxy which he finds it difficult to substantiate, and his difficulty becomes manifest when he deals with the Ascension, which he finds himself compelled to interpret "spiritually". So also he finds himself compelled to interpret spiritually the article of the Creed dealing with the Resurrection of the Body and understands it to mean the resurrection of recognizable personality.

It is apparent that these statements of orthodoxy in their original meaning cannot be made compatible with modern thought; the arguments that they were universally believed and that "The fact that the accounts vary and are not easy to fit together is evidence of their independence and faithfulness" are not cogent enough to sustain conviction (indeed Dr. Kirsopp Lake found in the inconsistencies of *Acts* a ground for scepticism about the Resurrection of the Body of Jesus). One could have wished that our author had ventured on re-statement of these great truths.

In the account of the origin of the Church Mr. Simmonds deviates from the excellent detachment and impartiality which marks his earlier studies. He cannot resist the temptation to interpret New Testament evidence with a view to authenticating episcopacy and the diocesan system. He is thus led to make statements such as "so we read of St. Paul on his missionary journeys ordaining elders (Presbyters = Priests) in every Church", and to quoting Clement of Rome A.D. 95 and Ignatius A.D. 110 as evidence for a primitive episcopal form of government. It would have been better had he contented himself with an exposition of the Church in *Acts* and the churches of Paul's foundation, and left to the evidence of history the warrant for belief in the episcopal system rather than to attempt to vindicate this form of Church organization on New Testament witness. Such attempts to account for any form of Church government are now recognized by students of Church history as precarious and uncertain.

Whether this book will be found readable by parish workers is doubtful. The language is not always easy, and sometimes is quite technical, although the author has a happy gift in the use of illustration. When he approaches the assertions of Christian doctrine from the standpoint of the actual human experience which they express he will no doubt be followed, but when he works the other way from the assertions of doctrine to experience he will, I fear, be found difficult to understand.

The book, however, is a praiseworthy attempt to meet a very real need, and one cannot help but seek for it, and the series it inaugurates, a good success.

LESLIE E. COOKE.

The Descent of the Dove. By CHARLES WILLIAMS. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Charles Williams has given to this interesting, indeed fascinating, short survey of Church history the sub-title "A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church". Mr. Williams writes in a fresh and stimulating way and gives to old stories and facts a new fascination. Nothing is perhaps more indicative of his method than the titles which he gives to his chapters to survey the different periods of Church history; *e.g.*, the interesting period from the middle of the second century to the period of Constantine is called "The Reconciliation with Time", the turbulent years from the collapse of the Roman Empire to the final division of East and West "The War of Frontiers", and the period of the Renaissance and Reformation is "The

Renewal of Contrition''. The author attempts no exposition or analysis of the nature of the Holy Spirit, but simply seeks to show the recurrence of its renewing life in the Church, in spite of the attempts of Kings and Emperors, Popes and Prelates, to crush it through organization. Mr. Williams is right in discerning the activity of that Spirit through the life and witness of individuals, and therefore tends to interpret the great periods of Church history in terms of the thought and experience of outstanding personalities. As a consequence this book is full of delightful pen pictures of great personalities and clear and concise expositions of their thought and message. Montanus, Tertullian, Origen, Augustine, Luther, Montaigne, Voltaire, Wesley, and Booth come within his purview. Each finds his place in the panorama which Mr. Williams paints, and each receives just dealing in the author's hands. Mr. Williams has a high appreciation of Dante's contribution to the life of Christendom, and he provides us with a telling exposition of the poet's thought which, he declares, was expressed ''for all the world, although the world has neglected to give it serious study''.

The key to the writer's interpretation of history is in his use of the word ''co-inherence'' which, oddly enough, finds its exposition in the post-script. His conclusion is not a pessimistic one (for what study of Church history can be pessimistic?), for

> if Christendom feels intensely within itself the three strange energies which we call contrition and humility and doctrine it will be again close not only to the war of frontiers, not only to Constantine, but to the Descent of the Dove. Its only difficulty will be to know and endure him when he comes and that, whether it likes it or not, Messias has sworn that it shall certainly do.

I have one serious disagreement with Mr. Williams, and that is that while he appreciates the emphasis and witness of Montanus and the Montanists in the second century, he ignores the movement which the Anabaptists, the Separatists, and the Independents represented in the 16th and 17th centuries, although these in fact had so much in common with the earlier movement, and indeed carried the emphasis of the Reformation to its logical conclusion. There was an uprush of the power and illumination of the Spirit, if ever there was one, and it seems strange that in a survey of the work of the Holy Spirit this should be ignored. This original and provocative study, however, deserves a wide welcome. We still await, nevertheless, an authoritative study of the nature of the Holy Spirit which has through the ages, as Mr. Williams has pointed out, been the reconciling factor between a historical emphasis on Transcendence on the one hand and Immanence on the other.

LESLIE E. COOKE.

The True Vine and its Branches. By EDWARD LEEN, M.A., D.D. Burns, Oates. 7s. 6d.

From the pen of a Roman Catholic writer comes yet another book to show the relevance of the Roman dogma and conception of the Church to the modern situation. The publisher's note and the theme of the introduction give the impression at first that the book is to provide a real contribution to the resolution of our modern difficulties.

The book in fact is a series of addresses or articles consisting mainly of interpretations of texts, rather uncritically taken from the New Testament, and presented in the light of Romanist teaching. Dr. Leen's thesis is that the world is in the grip of two seemingly irreconcilable movements or ''heresies'', an extreme nationalism, on the one hand, and internationalism

which he calls pseudo-Catholicism, on the other; his aim is to show how truths in each are synthesized in Roman Catholic dogma and ecclesiastical organizations, which, he claims, are based on the supreme concern of Christ for the unity of mankind. Having announced his thesis the author proceeds to a series of expositions of Roman doctrine. He outlines the orthodox plan of salvation, of the creation, of the redemption and the continuing of that redemptive work in the Church, and shows in that plan the place of the Eucharist, Prayer, the Mass, Asceticism, and the doctrines of merit and belief in the Virgin Mary. Here then seems to be the author's answer to our dilemma in the relationship of the believer personally to Christ, a relationship which is a mystical experience. A criticism of the book is therefore necessarily a criticism of the whole Roman position. The higher synthesis which the writer declares is necessary is a synthesis achieved not in unity but in uniformity, achieved by the acceptance of the Roman authority in doctrine and in organization. Those who can accept that authority will no doubt believe in Dr. Leen's remedies; those who believe that the only unity worth while is found in the safeguarding of personal liberty and individual experience will find no answer here.

The book will be of interest to all who have a real concern to understand the thoughts and experiences of others. Generally speaking, the writer's style is simple and direct, although sometimes—I suppose this is inevitable when interpreting mysticism—his thought is obscure. It seems to me that the publishers have done the author a disfavour in producing the book on a somewhat jaundiced paper.

LESLIE E. COOKE.

Knowledge and Character. By MAXWELL GARNETT, C.B.E., D.Sc. Cambridge Press. 18s.

This is a work of great erudition, which very few men would care to be asked to review. If the present writer, greatly daring, endeavours to give some account of it, it is with much diffidence. One's life may have been spent in the practice of education, yet to approach its study via sensori-motor arcs and afferent and efferent neurones, via endarchial zones and synapsis "thresholds", might well "fear the valiant". This at least can be said: the book has been read solidly through and, apart from a couple of tiny slips[1], it is a piece of fine able craftsmanship, which will probably exercise a quarter of a century hence a greater influence than it can possibly do to-day.

The book attempts to provide the theory of education with a psychological foundation, and this foundation is sought, strikingly enough, along lines largely physiological. It differs from its predecessor, *Education and World Citizenship*[2], in that its main approach is neurological, and attention is centred rather upon the comparatively simple material aspects of the brain than upon the mind or soul of the "educand". Laws of thought are formulated not by a study of logic but by way of changes in the intensity and distribution of neural dispositions or neurograms. Only in this way does Dr. Garnett see a possibility of arriving at a just understanding of what the aims of the educationist should be. A child's work and play should tell us what kind of a man he will make. The end of education then is to "integrate" the character of every child, to develop in him the means whereby he may realize his own best self and so serve perfectly his fellows and his God.

[1] Attribution of a Tennyson poem to Wordsworth and a piece of poor English transcribed from the Spens Report.

[2] Cambridge Press, 1921, a work to which the recent Spens Report is heavily indebted.

He should be a "complete" all-round man, a man not educated for this or that, but who was just educated, that and nothing more.

To the practical teacher two of the most interesting parts of the book will be its discussion of "wide and deep" education, and its advocacy of the reinstatement of the old "form-master". There is no time here really to enter upon either of these questions, but Dr. Garnett must expect plenty of criticism from teachers on both counts. In spite of a lengthy early protest against defining education by metaphor, he says here: "A cottage . . . ready for occupation may be of more value to the community than the foundations of a palace . . . never carried above the damp-proof course". This it might be argued is the *reductio ad absurdum* of his "wide *and* deep" argument. Similarly when he demands reinstatement of the form-master of our boyhood, he forgets his own contention: "it is not the subject but the methods of teaching that matter". It is precisely that question of "methods" which makes the old ideal of the form-master impractical in our schools to-day. What form-master is equal to using the modern (and compared with 40 years ago, the revolutionary) methods of, say, teaching geography or history or mathematics, and, still less, modern languages or, in many cases, ancient languages?

Christian teachers cannot be too grateful to Dr. Garnett for the way he insists upon the ultimate aim of education as being "to form Christian characters". The "paramount importance of religion in the life of every school" is emphasized in numerous ways and not least by a wholly felicitous use, in quite unexpected quarters, of texts from the Scriptures; the casual suggestion in one place that the "Repent" of the Gospels should be rendered "Re-arrange your minds", is a case in point. "It was Jesus Who summed up the ten commandments without saying 'thou shalt not' ". "We must not confuse the foundations of the Christian Church with its gargoyles"; "Hope is a public virtue as well as a private gain; its social value is less than that of brotherly love, but not much less: while there can be no comradeship without love there can be no leadership without hope" . . . . it is chippings like these which show the nature of the rock whence this big book is hewn.

SYDNEY H. MOORE.

The Problem Teacher. By A. S. NEILL. Jenkins. 5s.

This is a vulgar book. One can think of scarcely any English publisher who would consent to let loose upon the world such a farrago of nonsense and so ignorant a travesty of all that is best in the ideals and practice of our education of to-day. No teacher is of any value, forsooth, unless he encourages his boys to speak of him as a "silly ass" and to belard their conversation plentifully with such adjectives as "lousy" and "damned". Teachers who insist upon discipline in their work "never consider psychology: to them it is just damned rot". Masters "should flatly refuse to teach religion"; "what is termed sin does not exist", and "the idea that the teaching of Christianity is necessary to make children good is just superstitious nonsense". The teacher is "the dunce who has to remain at school all his life . . . the Peter Pan who fears to face adult life. Every teacher has remained a little child". "If he is respected by his pupils he is a failure". The teacher of to-day is "the man with childish values".

Only the man with the lance-corporal mind can adapt himself to such a system. A teacher can nag a crowd of children all day and be considered a good teacher. School authorities do not ask an applicant what he knows about children: if he is up in his "subject" nothing else matters.

There are some things of value in the book—a spirited trouncing of the "matriculation" fetish and "The motto over the gateway of every school should be: 'Casting out Fear' "; but the cheap extracts given above, which could be paralleled *ad nauseam,* rule the book out of serious consideration. Perhaps the wisest thing its author could do is to enter on a serious study of the massive volume by Dr. Maxwell Garnett, reviewed above. It would at any rate show him the spirit of scholarly, self-sacrificing devotion in which the work of real leaders of educational thought is performed.

SYDNEY H. MOORE.

Archbishop Laud. By H. R. TREVOR-ROPER. Macmillan. 21s.

This is a biography in the grand style, written with a masterly grasp of detail and a clear relation of it all to the central figure. The chapter describing the various bishops and their efforts or apathy in executing Laud's policy in the provinces is particularly good. Mr. Trevor-Roper is no great admirer of Laud, whom he calls "stolid and fussy", "the superstitious old bishop", "harsh and unsympathetic"; and he refuses to make Laud's fall into a tragedy, insisting that the reasons for his failure were the reasons for the opposition to him at the start. This resolute detachment leaves the author free to bring out the more clearly Laud's large political idealism, unselfish devotion to business, and scrupulous integrity, in a word the single-mindedness which was at once his greatness and his weakness, as it is the weakness of all who put principles before persons, so soon as they abandon theory for practice—and Laud was always *occupatissimus*. His Catholic ideals ("Deformation, not Reformation!") and his persecution of the Puritans and refugee congregations ("I know your doctrine,—parity of ministers,—hail, fellow, well met!") receive ample attention; but it is as a politician, to whom the Church was a political instrument, that Laud is here studied, and great stress is laid on his opposition to enclosures, his anxiety about depopulation, and his concern to recover impropriations. In Laud's theology Mr. Trevor-Roper is not interested: he considers a secular spirit alone impartial and, as "a profane historian", to whom "Selden's solvent scepticism" is refreshing after the "mumbo-jumbo of ecclesiasticism", he writes off the idea "that people really care about religious doctrines" as "a mistaken assumption". This is a strange approach to the 17th century, when, *e.g.*, after a public dispute about infant baptism, men would run up the street crying "Mr. Taylor hath got the day!" with an enthusiasm now reserved for football; it may explain why the characters in the book glitter a bit, instead of shining as by internal illumination. The William Dell who was a chaplain under Fairfax (p. 428) and later Master of Caius was not the William Dell who was Laud's secretary. "The heather Nonconformists" (p. 246) should presumably read *heathen*. An appendix contains 18 letters from Laud to Lord Scudamore, not before printed in full, and there is an excellent index. Of the eight illustrations (how pleased Laud would be!) St. John's provides three.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(*Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.*)

The names on the title page of *A Companion to the Bible* (Clark, 12s. 6d.) are sufficient guarantee of its sound scholarship. Its Editor is Dr. T. W. Manson, who is responsible for "The New Testament and Other Christian Writings of the New Testament Period" as well as for an admir-

able introductory chapter on "The Nature and Authority of the Canonical Scriptures". Among the other contributors are Drs. W. F. Howard, H. H. Rowley, W. O. E. Oesterley, W. M. Calder, J. W. Jack, T. H. Robinson, W. F. Lofthouse, C. H. Dodd, N. H. Snaith, and the Bishop of Truro. Useful appendixes include a note on the Calendar and a Chronology, and there are maps. The volume is remarkably cheap, and it is to be hoped that many ministers will receive a copy from members of their congregations who desire them to keep abreast of biblical learning.

We wonder what is the significance of the greatly increased interest in the Apocrypha. This quarter we have *Readings from the Apocrypha* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), selected and translated by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley, and Dr. E. J. Goodspeed's very useful but very dear *The Story of the Apocrypha* (Chicago and Cambridge Presses, 12s.), which takes the books in turn and then discusses the place of the Apocrypha in the Bible, in the New Testament, and in the Church.

We have now also, for the first time in one volume, the American translation of *The Complete Bible* (Chicago and Cambridge Presses, 18s.). This is the Smith-Goodspeed translation (O.T. Prof. J. M. Powis Smith and others: N.T. Dr. Goodspeed), together with Dr. Goodspeed's translation of the Apocrypha.

The selection *Bible Poetry* (Blackie, 3s. 6d.), made by the Bishop of Liverpool, will be welcomed by all lovers of the Bible and of English literature.

Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones's *Why Does God Allow War?* (Hodder, 2s. 6d.) offers in five sermons "a general justification of the ways of God". This is preaching at its best; it is soundly rooted in the Scriptures, but directly addressed to our condition to-day; it honours the listeners in asking their closest consideration and in never descending to anything cheap in the way of illustration. The first sermon, on prayer, is particularly good.

The third volume of the English translation of the *Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul to the Sisters of Charity* (Burns, Oates, 10s. 6d.) has now appeared. Students of the development of the spiritual life will find much that is suggestive.

Though repeatedly we want to shake Kierkegaard, we cannot stop reading him, and all about him, and Dr. Walter Lowrie has placed all students in his debt by his *Life* and translations. *The Point of View* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) contains various small works in which Kierkegaard expounds his attitude to his work as an author. While it is not always easy to understand his argument that even in his "æsthetic" works, as he calls them, he was a "religious" author, his defence of the method of starting from the non-Christian's position is interesting, and his contention that the Christian must compel others to "take notice" is powerfully urged. Kierkegaard agreed that he had "a genius for reflection", but one gets tired of his unhealthy concern with his own mental processes.

It would have been deplorable had Dr. W. M. Macgregor not gathered together in book form the twelve addresses in **Persons and Ideals* (Clark, 3s. 6d.). Especially good are the four personal addresses—on A. B. Bruce, James Denney, Alexander Whyte, and D. H. Hislop. Then come four discourses to students on the work of the ministry, and then four general papers, one of which, "The Religion of a Good Moderate", has much to say that is germane to the condition of religion to-day. It would be difficult to find 120 pages so wealthy in allusion, so sound in counsel, and so alive with the preacher's passion, as this little volume.

Sometimes the publication of collected papers by veterans is a matter of regret to their friends, but we are unfeignedly glad that Mr. H. A. L. Fisher has gathered together the articles and addresses which make up *Pages from the Past* (Oxford Press, 10s.). The volume opens with an imaginative picture of what would have happened had Napoleon escaped to America, with a delightful glimpse of the Emperor attending the Old South and asking if the Congregationalists were a species of Jesuits! The paper on "The Whig Historians" shows the author as historian, while the particularly happy studies of John Morley, Philip Snowden, and A. J. B. serve to remind us of the days when Mr. Fisher was at the Board of Education. Among the fifteen papers, indeed, are some for those with all tastes, and many apt references and illustrations which will keep notebooks in constant use. The comparison between visits to America in 1909 and 1924 makes interesting reading today. A pleasant volume for a railway journey or a long evening.

Dr. W. Wilson Cash has played so large a part in the work of the Church Missionary Society for a generation that few men have a greater right to survey the missionary task. *The Missionary Church* (C.M.S., 7s. 6d.) contains much food for thought for all Christians. Especially do we note its insistence on a policy of "self-supporting, self-governing, self-extending churches":

> Too often have we so trained young Churches as to encourage them to regard preaching as a paid office. One Indian worker frankly declared: "I discourage lay evangelism because if the Church did this voluntarily, I should lose my occupation!"

It is only when every member of a church recognizes that it is his duty to evangelize that the Church of Christ will be able to meet the challenge Dr. Cash describes in some graphic pages.

A Birmingham doctor, who describes himself as "A Medical Psychologist", has written a useful little book, *Fear and Depression* (Cornish, 5s.). Pertinent and practical, it is written for the lay reader and should be specially useful in these war days.

Some weird sentences, and commas in unusual places, mar, but do not spoil, Mr. Thomas Hope's biography, *Torquemada, Scourge of the Jews* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.). It is hard to remember that Torquemada was 58 when he introduced the Inquisition into Spain, having induced his monarchs and the Pope to acquiesce in that step. From that event to the expulsion of the Jews Torquemada was supreme in Spain. Mr. Hope sees him as a fanatic for the unity of Spain, the embodiment of the spirit of "nationalism militant" which used against the Jews the methods and weapons used by totalitarian rulers in our own day.

One is surprised to find no mention of Torquemada in Miss Francesca Claremont's *Catherine of Aragon* (Hale, 15s.), especially as it stresses Catherine's youth at the Alhambra and elsewhere in Spain. Miss Claremont is a champion of Catherine, and is less than fair to Anne Boleyn; the bravery and steadfastness of Catherine are their own recommendation, and are best left to speak for themselves. Miss Claremont's habit of reading character from portraits is scarcely to be recommended to the historian.

The Rev. C. E. Russell tells in *Rosenthal* (Centenary Press, 6s.) the story of George David Rosenthal, the Birmingham High Church "rebel". Bishop Gore said Rosenthal was "a young man not inclined to moderation", and the description may well be applied to him throughout his life. On the day he was ordained priest he rushed home to hear the confessions of 40 boys in the Church Lad's Brigade; he thought the Company ought to win a

drill competition because "they had all been to their duties". Rosenthal's defiance of episcopal authority is, of course, defended, and it is those in parishes where "the Faith is well established" who will appreciate a book written in a language which readers of this journal will find foreign. "Rosie" loved crowded audiences, and is said in his day to have been a great orator, though this scarcely appears in a volume of sermons, *Quest and Achievement* (Centenary Press, 5s.), highly praised as they are by the Bishop of Brechin, who writes an introduction. Rosenthal was clearly one of those susceptible to atmosphere; his emotions were perhaps too near the surface.

Had Miss Vera Brittain's *Testament of Friendship* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.), "The Story of Winifred Holtby", been half as long, it would probably have been twice as good. The two writers shared so much of life from Somerville onwards that Miss Brittain's knowledge is detailed and intimate; we are not even spared descriptions of dresses and weddings, always an affliction to male readers. It is neither this nor the many irrelevances which is the chief fault of the book, but the magnification of the work of a small coterie of women writers—the shilling obscures the sun. This is obvious from the first paragraph of the book where the visitor to Yorkshire a hundred years hence finds still alive the work of J. B. Priestley (a concession this), Winifred Holtby, Phyllis Bentley, and even Storm Jameson. Priestley, yes; but are the others really on the same level as Charlotte Brontë? They *may* live—we have enjoyed the works of them all—but we suspect that in 2040 they will be subjects for B.Litt. theses. That having been said, we must go on to say that the book holds the reader, both because of the way in which it is written, and because of the attractiveness of its subject, who, talented along many lines, could resist no call to service. Her main achievement, of course, was *South Riding*, in which she wrote of the country and the people she knew so well, but her poems and much of her journalistic work had marked distinction. She lived a full—a too full—life and died at 37. What she might have accomplished had she known a satisfying emotional life instead of the "strange, unresolved and yet indestructible relationship" with Bill must remain a speculation. The calibre of her mind (and the nature of her personal problem) may be indicated by one quotation:

> While our souls are in our bodies, absolute and contingent are bound up together. We cannot live on bread alone, nor without bread. We cannot see truth when frightened by starvation. We cannot extend our vision of reality when we have no freedom. St. Augustine's cry still holds us . . . . : but we are bound in mortality, prisoners in a world of compromise, where politics and æsthetics meet.

It is within the bounds of possibility that centuries hence when the name of Hitler is merely mentioned in histories, that of Chiang Kai-Shek will have a prominent place as the inspirer of the new China. And if that is the case Madame Chiang Kai-Shek will stand by his side, as she has done during the unification of China and the heroic resistance to the Japanese aggressor. The collection of her writings in *China in Peace and War* (Hurst & Blackett, 16s.) is very welcome, and it will bring to the notice of English readers one of the most remarkable and attractive women of our times. Educated in the United States, Madame Chiang Kai-Shek has kept in touch not only with her own College—Wellesley—but by broadcast addresses and articles she has made her personality felt in cultural centres there. A Christian, she has led her husband to Christianity, and works hand in hand with the missionaries who are standing by the Chinese in their sufferings. An idealist, she is yet an organizer, no detail being too insignificant for her attention. This book

will win for its writer not only the admiration, but even the affection, of many readers.

After C. T. Studd (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.), written by Mr. Norman Grubb, Studd's son-in-law, is a study of the Worldwide Evangelization Crusade, which now has 200 crusaders working in eleven fields. The Crusade is a "faith mission" and the book is packed with illustrations of "answer to prayer" comparable to those associated with the name of George Müller. In these and in his confidence of guidance in the details of life, the writer seems unconscious of any problem; on the N.W. Frontier, for example, Christians pray that they may be saved from locusts; so they are when every bush in the adjacent Mohammedan country is covered with them.

Readers of these pages have already discussed the population question in relation to the church life of the next generation; they would do well to follow up the subject in Mr. W. B. Reddaway's *The Economics of a Declining Population* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), in which such subjects as unemployment, the national income, international trade, and, of course, family endowment, are dealt with by a well-equipped scholar. Maybe, though it is to be hoped not, the war will increase the importance of this question, the urgency of which does not seem to have dawned on many people.

The collection of Essays in Prof. H. J. Laski's *The Danger of Being a Gentleman* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is typical of his many-sided activity. In the title essay his irony has full sway, the Inaugural "On the Study of Politics" is all that an Inaugural ought to be, with its survey of what has been and remains to be done, and there are essays on "Law and Justice in Soviet Russia", "The Judicial Function", "The English Constitution and French Public Opinion, 1789-1794", "The Committee System in English Local Government", "Nationalism and the Future of Civilization" (pathetic reading to-day), and a fine tribute to Mr. Justice Holmes on his 89th birthday in 1930.

Before these words are read the writer of this notice will have had the privilege of discussing international affairs with Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, the author of *How War Came* (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.). No broadcaster is listened to with greater respect in England than Mr. Swing, whose gift of seizing salient points and expounding them lucidly is almost unequalled. This volume contains his broadcasts in the United States from March 9 to August 18 last year, and then broadcasts twice and even three times a day during "the fourteen days" prior to Sept. 3 and the outbreak of war. It is thrilling to take this terrible journey once again and under this expert guidance.

Mr. Leonard Woolf is always worth reading, though he was perhaps fortunate in writing *Barbarians at the Gate* (Gollancz, 6s.) before the Russian aggression in Finland and Poland. His argument is well worth pondering: Athens and Sparta are prototypes of the nations in the modern conflict; Pericles, Jefferson, Churchill and Stalin (!) on one side, Sparta and Hitler on the other. Three strands go to make up civilization—communal power, economic power, and the recognition of social values. Liberals of the 19th century made the mistake of attempting to establish a civilized society of men in a political democracy while allowing three-quarters of the people to be enslaved by the economic system. The Soviets are making the opposite mistake, "establishing the only economic system compatible with western civilization in the industrialized societies of the 20th century",

while imposing a system of political dictatorship with a contempt for liberty, truth, tolerance, and humanity incompatible with civilization. Mr. Woolf makes a good point in showing that Hitler, while never wearying of abusing the principles of democratic, pacific, and humane civilization, yet relies on those principles in reasserting the "rights" of the German people violated by Versailles.

The Dean of Canterbury has been particularly unfortunate in the time of publication of his *The Socialist Sixth of the World* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.). The Soviet-Nazi pact and the savage attack on Finland have so disgusted the world that a book which aims at pointing out only those aspects of the U.S.S.R. which seem "truly creative and essentially good" (while omitting the "much remains that is not") is likely to receive short shrift. This is a pity, for dwellers in capitalist countries should be aware of Soviet achievements; and at present they are not. Even those who are amused by the Dean's enthusiasms will find food for thought in his autobiographical pages.

Sir Norman Angell is unfortunate, too, in that events have anticipated the publication of his *For What do we Fight*? (Hamish Hamilton, 6s.); we may agree that in marching into Poland Russia merely did as any other nation would have done and protected itself against an aggressive Germany; but can the same defence be urged for the Finnish invasion? The book is, however, a cogent and even passionate defence of a scheme of federal union; and the pricking of some of the fallacies about "haves" and "have-nots" is peculiarly effective. Decidedly a book for the times.

In **War, Pacifism and Peace* (S.P.C.K., 4s.) Prof. Robert Corkey has given us one of the most cogent arguments against the pacifist view that we have seen. He argues that the use of force in a Christian society is legitimate, when used by the proper people for proper ends, and the Christian Church

> ought to unite in a great campaign to create public opinion in support of a foreign policy which would put the defence of the international system of law and order before any other consideration.

His argument is well worth following out; his conclusion is:

> A federal world government, with all the agencies of government necessary for the management and control of international affairs, is indispensable to world peace.

Inside Germany (Constable, 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.) reprints from the *Daily Telegraph* the graphic articles on the state of Germany and England contributed by Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, the distinguished American journalist.

We shall soon begin to wonder where Miss Dorothy L. Sayers will break out next. Highly successful in several fields, she now tries a "war-time essay", *Begin Here* (Gollancz, 6s.). Miss Sayers admits that here she is an amateur, and at times that is obvious, but she could not fail to be stimulating. The best part of the essay is the plea for a thinking democracy, and for the recognition of the place of the creative thinker both in war and the making of peace. There is a useful "Note on Creative Reading", and an annotated list of books for black-out reading.

Not many paragraphs of Mr. Paul Super's *The Polish Tradition* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) had been read before it was clear that the author was an American: the analysis, almost the tabulation, of the qualities, strains, features, which make up the Polish tradition is so characteristic. Mr. Super has apparently lived in Poland for many years; he describes the

influence of geography and history on the life and outlook of the people. There are some good illustrations, notably the view of the Carpathian Mountains.

Were the world not in the midst of a tragedy we could be amused by Mr. John Scanlon's *But Who Has Won?* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.), if we took it in small doses. Sustained irony and sardonic humour for 270 pages become a strain. But we do well even now to recognize the folly of the "arming for peace" policy. Mr. Scanlon's style may be judged from the way he begins his 1939 chapter:

> Mr. Chamberlain did not really begin to prepare for war with Germany until he had signed the peace with that country.

Mr. Ford Madox Ford's playing at life and letters is never very impressive, and we see no reason to revise this verdict after carting about for some time a massive volume of over 800 pages called *The March of Literature from Confucius to Modern Times* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.). March, forsooth! We have tried in vain to discover either rhythm, rhyme, or reason in this chronicle of "the humaner letters of the world, a work of imagination and insight couched in clear, uncomplicated, and not harsh prose"—a description which the author might have left to his critics. Nor do we see why Mr. Ford includes one writer and rejects others. Rarely, indeed, have we found a book more baffling.

Now that he is back in the Army we wonder how far Mr. R. D. Q. Henriques is prepared to modify the picture of Army life he presents in his striking novel, *No Arms, No Armour* (Nicholson & Watson, 8s. 6d.). The Army's rolling out of all individuality, the blocking of all promotion to those who cannot fall in with routine, the effect on mind and morals of life in a lonely fort—these are topics which deserve discussion. Whether they can be adequately handled in fiction is another matter, and some of Mr. Henriques' characters scarcely come to life. Not all, for others, Sammy and Daddy, are very much alive. Those who want a novel to make them think will find it here; those who seek merely diversion and amusement had better turn elsewhere. Mr. Henriques has not yet reached the height of his powers; he has good work in him.

Karel Capek's moving play, *The Mother* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.), has been well translated by Mr. Paul Selver. One by one the mother loses husbands and sons; they come after death to dispute with her, until at last she sends her Benjamin to war.

The latest Hogarth Sixpenny Pamphlet is Mrs. Virginia Woolf's *Reviewing*, a shrewd and suggestive examination of the position of reviewing today.

EDITOR.

Dr. C. V. Pilcher's *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) is an honest and well-informed statement of the doctrine of the resurrection and relevant topics, as set forth in the Old Testament, the Apocryphal, Apocalyptic, Rabbinic and New Testament literatures, with a brief account of subsequent developments. There is also a chapter of comparative study (Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece). In the three earlier chapters, the author deals with the conceptions of the Messiah, the Kingdom of God, and various conceptions of what awaits man after death. (An appendix on the "Hereafter" in medieval Icelandic thought evidently indicates a special interest of the author.) The book is well documented and the judgments passed are sober and sensible. Whilst it cannot be said that it makes any original contribution to our knowledge of the vast field it

surveys, the book is a useful and reliable introduction to the subject for students and the general reader.

A strange book by the Rev. C. C. Dobson, called *The Mystery of the Fate of the Ark of the Covenant* (Williams & Norgate, 3s. 6d.), blends history and baseless speculation into an attempted proof that the prophet Jeremiah brought Jacob's stone to Ireland, whence it travelled by way of Scotland to the Coronation chair. The value of the author's arguments may be gauged by his twice-made remark that "Jeremiah or Jerry is perhaps the most popular of Irish names".

Miss Ursula Wells, in *Daniel: A Modern Prophet* (Vol. IX of the Interpreter Series, Murby, 1s.), has given us a stimulating study, based on sound knowledge, of an unusually difficult and challenging book of the Bible. The teacher will find its application of ancient truth to the world of to-day very suggestive.

Mr. W. A. Wordsworth's *En-Roeh: the Prophecies of Isaiah the Seer, with Habakkuk and Nahum* (Clark, 14s.), is a peculiar and perplexing book, which combines a large amount of ingenuity devoted to the Hebrew consonantal text of Isaiah with speculation of the Rabbinic type, but in the Christian interest. The resultant translation has a weird effect (increased by the new name for God which the author has invented, *Yeabe*). Thus the first part of *Is.* 7^{14} is represented as follows:—

> Therefore giveth the Lord:
> (To the sure-place he giveth my Lord:)
> Himself for you a sign.
> (To you (=women) he will give the Lord:
> This is to you (=men) a sign.)

Here the second line is an alternative rendering of the Hebrew consonants of the first, whilst the fourth line is a second alternative; the fifth line is an alternative to the third. The author regards such alternatives as "a secondary meaning, sealed for disciples." The note attached to the word "giveth" reads "From the verb nathan, alluding to the name of David's son, through whom Christ's genealogy is traced". It does not seem at all probable that such Rabbinisms will serve to convince the informed reader that Isaiah wrote not only all the Biblical book which bears his name, but also *Job,* and some of the *Psalms* and *Proverbs*. The reason for the inclusion of Habakkuk and Nahum in this volume is that the author would make them contemporaries of Isaiah. It is a pity that honest labour should have been devoted to a hopeless task, and we are not surprised at the ingenuous confession that the author had considerable difficulty in finding a publisher.

(Mrs. or Miss) M. Elizabeth Crouse's *The Making of the Book* (Heffer, 7s. 6d.) is a popular introduction to the Old Testament, with a brief review of the contents of the New Testament. The treatment is on the recognized lines of Biblical criticism, and is concerned to bring out the conflict between *II Isaiah* and *Ezekiel* as ultimately explaining the crucifixion of Jesus. Whilst the exposition is in general unobjectionable, there are better books of the kind by more authoritative writers.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Rev. E. H. Hobday has real qualifications for a writer of devotional studies. He reminds one of F. W. Boreham in his wide reading and apposite quotations, his lucid diction and his evangelical fervour. To a collection of twenty papers he has given the title of one of them, *The Sparrow in the Sanctuary* (Epworth Press, 4s.). It is unfortunate that its opening

sentences describe *Psalm* 84 as "sung by the pilgrims as they came within sight of the Temple on their return from captivity". And he might have avoided the tautology of "grateful thanks" in his acknowledgments. Such minor blemishes, however, do not detract from the work of a truly refreshing and inspiring book.

There are many amongst us who feel that the ancient creeds (Apostles' and Nicene) are very remote from modern life and its needs, and not a few attempts have been made to bring them into touch with present-day conditions. The task has been happily essayed by Dr. Robert E. Roberts in *The Comfort of the Creeds* (Epworth Press, 3s.). In seven concise studies (the Trinity, the Church, the Communion of Saints, Forgiveness, and the Life Everlasting) he draws out the permanent value of the affirmations with scholarly insight, and applies it with the same intimate understanding that he had previously shown in his study of the Beatitudes.

Dr. E. D. Bebb, who broke new ground in his scholarly work on *Nonconformity and Social and Economic Life 1660-1800* and has since given us a study of the personality and experience of Paul as "the man who got there", has now published under the title *The Man who is Different* (Epworth Press, 4s.) a series of a dozen studies on Christ's claims for Himself. We can repeat our commendation of Dr. Bebb's Paul volume—"preachers will find suggestions for sermons in every chapter", and add that others than preachers will find in it satisfying fare. The author has knowledge and sympathy; he is not content to ask and answer "What does the divinity of Christ mean?" but seeks to show and succeeds in showing what it means to the individual to-day.

Akin to Dr. Bebb's book in that both provide excellent material for Study Circles or Bible Classes is the Rev. B. C. Plowright's *Thy Kingdom Come* (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.). Here are twenty-eight concise but pregnant disquisitions on topics drawn from the Synoptic Gospels. They reveal an alert and well-furnished mind, and a praiseworthy endeavour towards that "new orientation of our Christian faith and our Christian ethics" which the author thinks is long overdue. Much has been written on the Kingdom of God, and much will be, for the theme is inexhaustible; it is gratifying but surely not unnatural, that a working minister should be able to make so pertinent a contribution to the subject.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

War literature is constantly increasing, and two of the latest additions to it are well worth while. One is *The British Case* by Lord Lloyd (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 9d.), and the other *The Moral Issues of the War* by the Dean of St. Paul's (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1s.). In the former Lord Lloyd gives a trenchant and dispassionate account of all those circumstances and conditions which have conspired to make the present conflict unavoidable, while in the latter Dr. Matthews makes quite clear the moral issues at stake and vindicates our action in defending those moral and spiritual values without which life is not worth living. The two booklets cover a good deal of the same ground but from different points of view. They supplement one another and taken together present a really unanswerable case.

The Archbishop of York is sponsoring a new series of books for Lenten reading. The first of them, called *The Two Moralities* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 3s.), is by Dr. Lindsay, Master of Balliol, and if the other books in the series keep up to its level they will be indeed remarkable. By the two moralities Dr. Lindsay means the morality of "my station and its duties" on the one hand, and the morality of grace, or of the challenge to perfection, on the

other. He points the contrast between a man's duty as a social and political animal and his duty as a child of God. This often involves a dilemma which is very keenly felt by many people in these distressful days, and Dr. Lindsay's treatment of it is so sane and candid and sympathetic that it cannot fail to give much needed comfort, guidance, and help. This is a really great little book and deserves to be read, pondered, and re-read.

W. B. Selbie.

Canon Peter Green's *The Path of Life* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is a "book of detached paragraphs" dealing with the Christian life. There are chapters on such subjects as "Doubts and Difficulties", "Times of Trial and Testing", "The Meaning of Life"; but in each chapter the paragraphs are complete in themselves, and are based on a text of Scripture. The method involves a certain slightness of treatment, but the result is effective. Here is a fund of illustration and suggestion; a great deal of practical wisdom and common sense, and much that will prove very helpful. I can imagine ministers getting many a good hint for a sermon out of these paragraphs.

Canon F. A. Cockin has written a short series of papers, *Praying in War Time* (S.C.M., 9d., paper covers) in the list of "War Time Discussions". They have much in them that is interesting, and also discerning; but the subject needs much fuller discussion to be really satisfactory.

Dr. James Reid's *Facing Life with Christ* (S.C.M., 5s.) is the fruit of long pastoral experience, and of a mind which looks sympathetically at the common problems of daily life, both in the home and outside. It is written without embroidery, and in a spirit which will bring help and encouragement where they are most needed in the midst of pressing cares and anxieties. And behind all that is said is a Gospel which faces the larger questions of the day. This is a book direct from the heart, and full of Christian understanding.

Dr. C. J. Shebbeare's *Christianity and other Religions* (Centenary Press, 3s. 6d.) is one of the volumes in the excellent Christian Challenge series. Its value and interest are very much greater than the modest claims Dr. Shebbeare makes for the book. As a study in Comparative Religion it is on lines of its own, and goes further into the background of religion itself than is usual in studies of this kind. The actual outline of other religions is brief. But there is unity of aim throughout, and the claim of Christianity over other religions is made clear. The student will appreciate this book; and except in certain rather mathematical Appendixes it is well within the range of the general reader.

Miss Evelyn Underhill's *Abba* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), a series of meditations based on the Lord's Prayer, breathes the spirit of a Christian mysticism in close sympathy with the Catholic tradition of the Church. It is beautifully written, and beautiful in its thought. It also has many illuminating quotations from the greatest masters of prayer. "On the frontier between prayer and history stands the Cross. . . . We live in illusion till that wisdom has touched us." This is a book of profound spiritual worth.

The Dean of St. Paul's has written the Bishop of London's Lent Book for this year under the title *Following Christ* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.). Dr. Matthews has much that is intimately true to say on a subject which is at the centre of the Church's need to-day.

Canon J. O. Hannay's *The Potter's Wheel* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) contains twelve short essays on subjects which lend themselves to "thoughts on the ways of God with men". The first of the essays, "The Potter's Wheel",

gives the title to the book. The experiences of life work towards the stilling of our doubts, even if we never entirely overcome them. These essays have a literary cast which adds greatly to one's pleasure in reading them.

It was a very happy idea to publish these broadcast talks, *Asking Why* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.), between a Chaplain and his boys; in them the Rev. R. S. Wright and the Rev. A. W. Loos reveal their skill in the difficult art of talking with boys. The subjects discussed are the central Christian beliefs: among them is the question of prayer, which is dealt with simply, but with a fine apprehension of the difficulties which beset it. The discussion of prayer is perhaps the best, but all are very good. This book ought to be widely circulated. It will repay any minister's careful study, and especially its method. Prof. A. E. Taylor writes a foreword of commendation of this attempt to meet the campaign of "sheer bluster" against the Christian faith, which is being carried on amongst the young to-day.

Prof. Lancelot Hogben's *Dangerous Thoughts* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is a little unfortunate in its title, which suggests dangers that are not there; the book is much more balanced and restrained than the title leads you to expect. There are papers and addresses on some live questions such as "Planning for Human Survival", and "Adult Education To-day". The best papers are those on the teaching of science, and on what science should be able to do in the future for social well-being. After reading them I am not sure that Prof. Hogben is quite satisfied that science, even if taught according to his own ideas, can do all that he hopes for from it; not even that "scientific Humanism" which he sketches in the first essay. Can it satisfy the cravings of man's spirit? It might be worth while to compare some of these over-confident papers, or seemingly over-confident, with Matthew Arnold's lecture on "Literature and Science". One other thing: University teaching is no doubt open to criticism, but Prof. Hogben greatly overdoes the thing, and he seems to me unfair to the University professor. Is not Prof. Hogben one of them himself? These are faults, and can easily become serious faults; but there is much in the book which will stir thought, and do good.

The volume *Arnold* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.) in the Clarendon series of English Literature will be a delight to all lovers of Matthew Arnold, and should win for him many new readers. It contains essays on Arnold by Mr. Lionel Johnson, and Prof. H. W. Garrod; an introduction by Sir E. K. Chambers, and Sir William Watson's poem, "In Laleham Churchyard". The frontispiece is G. F. Watts's painting in the National Portrait Gallery. From Arnold's poetry the selections could hardly be bettered. Here are "Thyrsis" and "The Scholar Gipsy" in full; and of the shorter poems, "Dover Beach" and "A Summer Night". Arnold's prose is not easy to reproduce in short excerpts: but one is glad to have the tribute to Newman from the lecture on Emerson; and of course the famous eulogy of Oxford from the Preface to *Essays in Criticism;* and I suppose Arminius and Esau Hittall and the dreadful Mr. Bottles had to be included—but Arnold himself would have left them out. The book is admirably produced, and is a pleasure to handle.

A. T. S. James.

At once a history and a critique, brief and balanced, of the main stream of English poetry from Chaucer to Yeats, Prof. B. Ifor Evans's *Tradition and Romanticism* (Methuen, 6s.) is to be commended for its wide tolerance. For once the critic does not manipulate the poets in deference to a theory. He has, *mirabile dictu,* an equally sane and sympathetic approach to poets as diverse as Keats and Johnson. He points out that the poets themselves

have not looked upon their predecessors with bitterness; that here as elsewhere compromise has been the keynote of the English tradition, and that in consequence distinct "schools of poetry" on the continental model have never existed in England. In particular, the opposition of "romantic" and "classical" in English poetry has been exaggerated by critics; the gulf, for example, between the Augustan Age and the Romantic Revival is largely a matter of convention. This is the most stimulating and unorthodox section of the book. But timely and valuable, too, in view of recent disparagement, is the rehabilitation of Milton, Tennyson, and even the "decadent" Ernest Dowson, here rightly recognized as a minor but authentic figure in the great tradition. In a short notice of such a book, criticism would be ungenerous, but one misses any reference to Andrew Marvell, whose *Thoughts in a Garden,* a touchstone of English poetical excellence, illustrates so strikingly the continuity of the romantic tradition.

P. A. Spalding.

We have had various accounts of Masaryk, but *Benes of Czecho-Slovakia,* by Mr. Godfrey Lias (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), is the first complete biography in English of the man who, after 17 years as Foreign Minister, succeeded Masaryk as President. Like Masaryk, in coming from a Catholic peasant family (he is the youngest of ten), and in having been a professor, Benes differs from him in being strongly realist, almost prosaic; religiously he is agnostic. He has a wife who was ready to suffer imprisonment and years of separation for the cause, but no children. The author traces his patient work as a revolutionary during the war years through to victorious recognition of his aims, and gives a careful account of his policy at Geneva, where he never failed to uphold League ideals. His most impressive traits are moderation, restraint, and belief in reason (he was never in the army), combined with strong nerves and innate optimism. Mr. Lias writes with keen sympathy but not uncritically. The book is occasionally repetitious; a bracket has become a comma on p. 242.

The Three Dictators, by Mr. Frank Owen (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), which is "a story of force and fraud", though the author is "not concerned to prove any theory", provides a separate account of the "public life" of each of them. We learn, or are reminded, that Mussolini is only 5 ft. 6 ins.; that he and Stalin were both originally intended for the Church; that Hitler's father's name was Schücklgruber; that *Mein Kampf* is "a spoken, not a written book". Of the three, Hitler appears indubitably the "greatest", in the sense of the most dæmonic. Three striking caricatures ornament the book, which in style is not unpleasantly journalistic.

Mr. George Lansbury's *This Way to Peace* (Rich & Cowan, 3s.) is an outspoken and appealing plea for the Christian Pacifism and Christian Socialism to which he has given such unstinted devotion. Acutely conscious of the economic causes of war, he asks for the immediate holding of a disarmament conference, at which imperialism may be abandoned openly in favour of world co-operation. The conclusions at the end of the Van Zeeland report are printed in full.

The reason *Why The Christian Church Is Not Pacifist,* according to Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr (S.C.M., 9d.), is that it does not equate the gospel with the law of love at the expense of the fact of sin; it recognizes the latter as a permanent factor in human history, which will be involved in sin's contradictions to the end.

Probably a fair number of Congregationalists will be among those put off by the title the Dean of Durham has chosen for his pamphlet, *The Last*

Crusade (Milford, 6d.); but he forestalls all objections very winningly and fairly, and with a sincerity free from Pharisaism writes what is less a manifesto than an appeal to make (or keep) the war a crusade.

All who know Rev. McEwan Lawson will welcome *The Five Pigs and other Curly Tales* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d. & 1s.), whether they have met them before or not. Only Mr. Lawson could have curled them: incomparable.

A Bookseller Looks Back, by Mr. J. S. Bain (Macmillan, 15s.), is the story of the House of Bain through several generations and of the bookselling business carried on by the family for over a hundred years. Quotations from Louisa Bain's diary of "Dry Facts, no Feelings" (1857-83) fill six chapters, and extracts from James Bain's note-books, about literary talk and people, take two. Many well-known people were friends of the business, from Disraeli to Sir Hugh Walpole, who writes a preface. The book is curiously rambling and lacking in co-ordination, but is full of most interesting tit-bits.

Religion and the English Vernacular, by Mr. R. R. Williams (S.P.C.K., 4s. 6d.), is a study of "the movement through which the Medieval Latin Scriptures and Services were gradually replaced in the life of the English Church by Scriptures and Services in the English tongue", with the stress on the combination "Scriptures and Services". The book is not one of original research, but surveys the evidence to hand from the angle of interest in the religious experience which lay behind the movement.

In *Alexander Penrose Forbes* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) the Dean of Edinburgh has followed up a study of George Hay Forbes with a life of his brother, the Bishop of Brechin from 1847 till his death in 1875, "the Scottish Pusey". An acquaintance of Routh at Oxford and a life-long intimate of Pusey, Forbes played a leading part in the strengthening in the Scottish Episcopal Church of those Catholic traditions which had never been wholly lost. Dr. Perry tells here of the fight he had: even from his brother bishops he had to endure censure.

Not only research students will be abundantly grateful to the scholars who have contributed to the *Handbook of British Chronology* edited by Prof. F. M. Powicke (Royal Historical Society, 7s. 6d.). Here are handy dated lists, extending sometimes to the present day, sometimes not later than the medieval period, of British rulers, officers of state, bishops, and peers, of parliaments, church councils, regnal years and saints' days. The work of collating the contributions seems to have been left for the second edition; of many discrepancies we have noted over a dozen between Mr. Southern's pages and pp. 33-57, nor does he follow Prof. Johnstone's correction (p. 375) of Edmund of Cornwall's birth-date to 1249.

Unwritten History and How to Read It, by Mr. W. P. Westell and Miss K. Harvey (Macmillan, 2s. 6d.), covers British history from Avebury to the Saxons in a way which should interest children of about 12. There are chronological picture tables and 92 sketches and illustrations.

Other recent children's books are *George Augustus Selwyn, Pioneer Bishop of New Zealand,* by Mr. A. W. Reed (Pickering & Inglis, 1s. 3d.), which is intended as a stirring adventure tale, and *The Life of St. Dominic,* by a Dominicaness of Headington, and *St. Thomas of Canterbury,* by Mr. George Mills (Burns, Oates, each 1s.), which are more purely pious.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

On a Reformer's Latin Bible, by the Rev. J. Y. Batley (Deighton, Bell, 4s.), is a study of the *adversaria* in a copy of the Vulgate which was once

Thomas Bilney's and is now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Its purpose is to show how the man who was the leading spirit in the "White Horse" gatherings interpreted his Bible. In some of the selected *adversaria* here printed Bilney finds biblical justification for confession, but he shows the new spirit in his notes on free grace, free will, and good works, as also in his insistence that the Church can err. A typed copy of the entire *adversaria* is to be placed in Trinity Hall library.

The first two volumes of Prof. K. S. Latourette's monumental *History of the Expansion of Christianity* were welcomed in these pages last July. In the "Three Centuries of Advance 1500-1800" (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 18s.) dealt with in the third volume, "Christianity expanded chiefly through Roman Catholicism" and in the index the Jesuits have easily the most entries. Congregationalism, which Prof. Latourette calls "an outgrowth of the blending of Independents and Puritans", has four entries, but receives unremarked attention in the persons of John Eliot and others. Reasons suggested for the lack of any missionary sense in early Protestantism are its struggle for its own existence, its expectation of an imminent end of the world, its rejection of the machinery of monasticism, and its lack of geographical adjacency to non-Christian peoples. Moreover, "the Protestant ideal . . . presupposed that Christianity was the nominal faith of the group". Needless to say, the book is thoroughly documented and has an extensive bibliography (in which Dexter might find a place). Bp. Hooker should be Hooper on p. 377, n. 4, Unamono Unamuno twice on p. 440, n. 40, and *Dedanke Gedanke* on p. 475.

Prof. C. J. Burckhardt's *Richelieu—his Rise to Power* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) is a work of first class importance for the reconstruction of the years 1616-31 in Europe. Although Richelieu and the France for which he toiled are kept central, the stage is large, and the policies and personalities of almost every court in Europe are disentangled with a sure hand. Moreover, the story is told livingly, with that balance of psychology and eventuality in the telling which is the mark of a great historian. The author, who has occupied Chairs of History in his native Switzerland, has also been in politics as League High Commissioner for Danzig, and occasionally one suspects a tacit modern reference. The book is unannotated but very evidently based on the researches of an original mind; it is a pity that it is marred by a number of misprints and a queer index, where, *e.g.*, Ancre and Concini appear as separate persons and all but one of Mary Tudor's entries refer to Marie de' Medici. The translation sometimes lapses unexpectedly, but not often; portraits of the chief characters illustrate the book. The promised further volume will be eagerly awaited.

Mr. S. Reed Brett's *John Pym, 1583-1643* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) is less a biography in the usual sense, since so little is known of Pym's earlier life, than a faithful tracing of the Parliamentary policy of the man who, he says, was for the last two years of his life "the director of the State", "King Pym". This account of the struggle for Parliamentary principles is particularly timely just now. Pym's part in contemporary colonial enterprise receives attention, and the author stresses his strong moderation alike in politics and religion, insisting that he would never have been a regicide and pointing out his abhorrence of the name "Puritan" and "those grosse errours of Anabaptisme, Brownisme, and the like". His conception of both religion (p. 109) and government (p. 176), Mr. Reed Brett argues, was conservative and Elizabethan.

Jonas Hanway, 1712-86, by Mr. J. H. Hutchins (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.), is a painstaking account of the seamy side of English life in the eighteenth

century and of the efforts made to improve it by Hanway, who worked nobly for such institutions as the Foundling Hospital, the Marine Society for apprenticing poor boys in the navy and aboard merchantmen, and the Magdalen Home for the help of repentant prostitutes. Hanway was an Anglican, to whom Methodism was repugnant, and who considered Whitefield preached "like an inhabitant of Bedlam". His abhorrence of gin and spirits was unfortunately extended to tea, which occasioned a controversy with Dr. Johnson. He was the first man to carry an umbrella in London.

Lord Ponsonby's *The Crank* (Allen & Unwin, 1s.) is an attractive piece of pacifist propaganda in the form of a discussion between three men, which was originally published in 1916. "The crank" asserts his conviction that "force of arms never has, and never will, crush militarism" and urges the necessity of "the democratic control of foreign policy".

Mr. Walter Brierley's *Danny*, of whom wireless-minded readers may already have heard, now appears in a full-length novel (Duckworth, 8s. 3d.), in which his fortunes are traced *aetat.* 10-13, from satisfaction with his father's company through the "gang" period and (later) absorption in a single friend to temporary self-sufficiency. We liked best his meeting with Tony (pp. 210 f.).

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (Jan.). Of topical note are articles entitled "Sigmund Freud" by Dr. E. S. Waterhouse, and "To End Hitlerism" by Dr. W. F. Lofthouse. A Congregational contributor is Mr. B. L. Manning (here called Professor), who reconsiders Wesley's hymns, with a special study of his use of metre. Dr. W. F. Howard surveys New Testament Studies on the Continent.

Hibbert Journal (Jan.). The Editor opens with a consideration of "Mr. Wells on the Fate of Homo Sapiens". Prof. W. G. de Burgh and Prof. F. J. C. Hearnshaw suggest "The Abuse of Knowledge" and "Miscarriage of Good Intentions" respectively as "Sources of Present World-Trouble", and Dr. Paul Van Schilfgaarde points "The Pathway to World-Unity". Among other articles is a penetrating study of "The Unstable Mind of the German Nation" by Prof. F. H. Heinemann, formerly of Frankfurt. Prof. Jas. Moffatt contributes a masterly "Survey of Recent Theological Literature".

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" considers "The World in Travail", and comes down heavily on the side of the League of Nations. John S. Hoyland puts "The Case for World Federation Now", and Maurice L. Rowntree suggests queries "Towards a Christian Social Order". An old Quaker diary is printed, also a letter from Woolman.

The Modern Churchman (Dec.-Feb.). In these three numbers three sermons preached before the University of Oxford by the Bishop of Truro are printed, "The Spirit of Man and the Spirit of God". The War and Pacifism receive attention in correspondence and in the notes of the editor, who also writes an article, "The Prince of Peace".

Expository Times (Jan.-Feb.). Besides the regular features, Rev. F. C. Spurr writes on "The Bankruptcy of Human Wisdom", Dr. Nicol Macnicol on Tambaram, and Rev. F. W. Dillistone on "Christian Propaganda". Dr. Garvie pleads for a wider observance of the Christian Year, and Prof. H. Cunliffe-Jones has an article on Eschatology.

International Review of Missions (Jan.). Almost the whole of this number is taken up by the Editors' "Survey of the Year 1939". Dr. H. F. Rall writes on "Authority of Our Faith", and Rev. C. F. Andrews contributes a note on "India and Segregation".

World Dominion (Jan.). The Rev. A. McLeish tells "Where Sunday-Schools are Flourishing", Miss A. Mildred Cable writes of a young Chinese evangelist who was "Led Out to be Shot"; "Soviet Shadows in Turkestan", by the last missionary to be driven out, and "Christians in Russia To-day" (approximately 20,000 religious organizations) are illuminating, as is "Spanish Outlook" by "Onlooker".

Evangelical Quarterly (Jan.). Dr. R. J. Drummond writes of "The Voice of God" in Nature, Christ and the Cross, Prof. G. H. Clark of "Miracles, History, and Natural Law". Biblical articles are "Ezra and Nehemiah" by the Rev. J. S. Wright, "Amos" by Prof. P. W. Miller, and "The Parousia as Revealed in the Gospels" by Mr. S. B. Babbage, while Mr. A. N. Prior in "The Analogy of the Faith" studies Knox's use of Scripture.

Harvard Theological Review (Jan.). The main articles are "Saul Who Also Is Called Paul", by Mr. G. A. Harrer, and "The Contribution of *Existenz-Philosophie*", by Mr. J. S. Bixler. Mr. M. P. Nilsson writes on "The Origin of Belief Among the Greeks in the Divinity of the Heavenly Bodies", and Mr. K. Latte on "The Coming of the Pythia".

Anglican Theological Review (Jan.). Mr. A. C. Zabriskie considers "The Permanent Significance of Evangelicalism in the Episcopal Church", Mr. R. C. Miller discusses "The New Naturalism and Christianity".

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin includes an appreciation of "Walter Rauschenbusch" by Dr. D. R. Sharpe, and a study of the seventeenth century "Benjamin Harris, Publisher Extraordinary" by Mr. E. C. Starr.

The Review and Expositor (Jan.). Articles on "The Status of Race Relations in New Orleans in 1939" and "Unemployment—a Maladjustment Problem" give a social colour to this number. Dr. J. C. Slemp writes on "The Essence of Christianity", and a sermon by Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke is printed.

The Review of Religion (Jan.). Prof. D. C. Macintosh asks "Is Theology Reducible to Mythology?", in criticism of his former pupil, Prof. R. Niebuhr. Prof. P. L. Lehmann writes on "The Authority of the Church and Freedom". Book reviews take 70 pages.

Theological Studies (Feb.) is the first number of a new quarterly which is sponsored by the seven American provinces of the Society of Jesus and is to be devoted to scientific and technical theology, with special reference to the work of English-speaking theologians. In this number Fr. W. J. Burghardt asks "Did St. Ignatius of Antioch Know the Fourth Gospel?", Fr. J. E. Coleran in "The Sacrifice of Melchisedech" justifies Jerome's rendering *waw* by *enim* in *Gen.* 14^{18}, and Fr. G. Ellard writes of the votive masses of Alcuin, than whom "perhaps no single individual has ever exercised so much discretionary power over the piety of the subsequent Roman Catholic world". There is an interesting feature, "Current Theology", as well as several reviews.

Revue Biblique (Oct.). Kirsopp and Silva Lake write on *De Westcott et Hort au Père Lagrange et au-delà*, Père A. M. Dubarle discusses the *Rédacteur et destinataires de l'Épitre aux Hébreux*, and Père F. M. Abel continues his study of *Les confins de la Palestine et de l'Égypte sous les Ptolémées*.

The chief articles in the **Nouvelle Revue Théologique** (Sept.-Oct.: concluded in the following number) are *Le linceul de Turin et l'évangile de saint Jean*, by Prof. Braun of Fribourg, in which *John* $19^{39\text{-}40}$, $20^{5\text{-}7}$ receives more attention than the alleged winding-sheet venerated at Turin; and an *Essai sur la nature de l'Unité religieuse* by the late Mr. Arthur Smallwood of the British Admiralty. In the number for Nov.-Dec. there is also a list of all persons beatified or canonized between 1914 and 1925 inclusive, of whom the only one from these islands is Oliver Plunket (1629-1681).

In Extremis, 1939, No. 4/5, is interesting for its account of the World Conference of Christian Youth held at Amsterdam last July. Various writers describe the preparatory conference, the Bible studies, the discussion groups and the different types of worship, and Prof. Niebuhr's paper on the Christian attitude to war, *Der Christ in der Welt der Konflikte*, is printed. No. 6/7/8 has Dr. Barth prominent, with an *Erklärung von Markus 13* and a most telling open *Lettre aux protestants de France*. The Archimandrite Cassian, now of Paris, contributes a study of the Johannine eschatology, and there are articles on Antichrist in the New Testament, and in history and Christian life.

G. F. N.

ALSO RECEIVED.

A. H. Reed. *Samuel Marsden.* Pickering. 1s. 3d.
C. C. Martindale, S.J. *Letters from their Aunts.* Rich & Cowan. 3s. 6d.
R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. *The Four First Things.* Longmans. 3s. 6d.
D. T. Niles. *Whose I am and Whom I serve.* S.C.M. 1s.
H. S. Linfield. *State Population Census by Faiths.* Hasid's Library Service. 2 dollars.

H. I. Smith. *Anglican Weddings.* S.P.C.K. 1s.
F. N. Keen. *Crossing the Rubicon.* Cornish. 1s. 6d.
Studies in Quaker Thought and Practice. Friends' Home Service Committee. 1s.
Maurice F. Hewett. *Brookfield Hymns.* 6d.
Hymns for the Times. Epworth Press. 2d.
The Cotswold Bruderhof.
Pitt Bonarjee. *The Office of the Holy Communion.* Independent Press. 1s. 3d.
G. L. Russell. *Sex Problems in Wartime.* S.C.M. 1s. Sensible and useful.
Chas. A. Puncker. *More Little Talks.* Pickering. 2s.
G. M. Young. *The Age of Trevelyan.* Milford. 1s. 6d. Warton Lecture on English Poetry at the British Academy. Quite excellent.
Efficiency in Soldiering, by a Junior Officer. Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions. 2d.
A Pilgrim's Wallet, arranged by Leslie F. Church. Epworth Press. 1s. Texts and quotations under devotional headings.
A. Simpson. *The Sunny Way.* A. Brown (Hull). 1s. Poems.
Sir Harold Bellman. *Christianity and Commerce.* Epworth Press. 4d.
L. D. Weatherhead. *Prayer in War Time.* Epworth Press. 4d.
W. F. Lofthouse. *Why Do Nations Fight?* Epworth Press. 4d.
W. W. Simpson. *The Christian and the Jewish Problem.* Epworth Press. 4d. The first four of "Pilot Books", dealing with the Christian and World Affairs.
G. Crowther. *Paying For The War.* Clarendon Press. 3d.
Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond. *The Naval Role in Modern Warfare.* Clarendon Press. 3d. Nos. 25 & 26 of the Oxford Pamphlets on World Affairs.